



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1995

No. 88

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BONILLA].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 25, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable HENRY BONILLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O God, for Your gift of healing—healing of body, mind, and spirit. Our petitions are for estrangement to be replaced by reconciliation and alienation to be replaced by trust. We pray that Your spirit will touch people's lives, that illness will be displaced by strength, and anxiety be overcome with confidence. We place these petitions before You, O God, that Your power, that created the Heavens and the Earth and every living person, will live in our lives and nurture us along life's way. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SKAGGS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests today at the end of business.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO LIMIT AMENDMENTS, OFFER AN AMENDMENT, AND EXPAND DEBATE TIME ON H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, No. 1, during the further consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill H.R. 1561, pursuant to House Resolution 155, that other than pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of House Resolution 155, no further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be in order except those printed in the amendments portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on or before May 24, 1995;

No. 2, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, is authorized to offer an amendment notwithstanding the preprinting-in-the-CONGRESSIONAL-RECORD requirement above or in House Resolution 155;

No. 3, consideration of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule may continue on the same terms as during the initial 10-hour period under House Resolution 155 for an additional period of 6 hours and may extend beyond 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 25, 1995; and

No. 4, no further amendment shall be in order after the additional 6-hour period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what we need

on this whole international relations legislation is some bipartisanship consistent with the history of this Congress in providing some bipartisan support for Presidents, regardless of party, in the conduct of our international relations.

My concern is that what we have, instead, is a 352-page detailed bill micromanaging foreign policy. Mr. Speaker, I do not think 6 hours more of talk, if it is the kind of talk that we have had throughout the course of this debate so far, is going to get us any nearer a bipartisan foreign relations bill.

It is obvious, since this bill was supposed to be crammed through yesterday, that the votes are not there for this kind of micromanagement.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of that, I object to the request, because it has already been decided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will not go into the issue that the gentleman just brought up. I would call for an emergency meeting of the Committee on Rules right now in room 314.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT EXPANSION

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H5577

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOGGETT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the House bill, H.R. 483, be instructed to resolve the difference between the House's 8½-year program and the Senate's 5-year program of medicare select policies, within the scope of the conference, in light of the changes in Medicare—the program that medicare select policies supplement—to increase beneficiary cost-sharing and to limit choice of provider as contemplated in this year's budget process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Medicare Select bill does not take into consideration the tremendous changes that are going to be made in Medicare under the budget resolution which was approved in this House, unfortunately, within the last week. This Medicare Select legislation does not take into consideration the fact that though no Member of the majority has come forward to tell the American people, they are proposing a doubling of the deductible for those on Medicare. They are proposing to increase, to add new charges if a senior citizen needs to go to a lab as a result of the doctor's orders. They are proposing new charges for home health care. They are proposing that even if one has the audacity as an American senior to say, "I want the doctor that I have always had, and I would like to stay with my own doctor, the doctor of my choice," that will be an extra \$20 a month.

All of these things need to be considered by the conferees. That is what this motion is designed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize what the effect of this Medicare Select will be, unless we have these conferees instructed to consider this increase that has been proposed in the budget resolution increasing out-of-pocket costs to seniors, where we are going to end up. Many American seniors right now are just barely able to make a go of it. They have to make, in my district, from some of the people that I have talked with, individual seniors, they have to make a decision between whether or not they will have enough food on the table or whether

they will have to pay the prescription bill that is not covered by Medicare at present.

With regard to those seniors, to now load them up with additional out-of-pocket costs, charging them to see their own doctor, doubling their deductible, increasing their premiums year after year, those are the changes that have been proposed by one of the secret task forces. Those are the changes that, when it came to the floor of this Congress, after all the debate on the budget measure, not one Member was willing to come forward and fess up to the fact that those changes are there, that they are being made in the Medicare Program.

Of course, no consideration has been given in this Medicare Select bill, which is not a bad idea to have Medicare Select, it just does not solve the problem if we load onto American seniors all of those additional charges.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, through this instruction is to see that the conferees consider these really drastic changes. It increased out-of-pocket charges, which so many American seniors are going to have more of every year unless the conferees give adequate consideration to this.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, to add a word or two at this point.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is considering legislation of great importance to the American people. The bill before us and the matter on which the conference will commence between the House and Senate is the so-called Medicare Select Program.

Mr. Speaker, the bills for which we are appointing conferees expand the Medicare Select Demonstration Program.

And although many support this program, I believe that because the Medicare cuts required by the Republican budget are so drastic and will require such fundamental reductions in the Medicare Program, it is irresponsible to pass any Medicare legislation, including extending Medicare Select, without taking these reductions into account.

Medicare Select is a preferred-provider managed care plan that pays cost sharing for Medicare beneficiaries if they go to a selected list of providers. It will not pay for cost sharing if beneficiaries go to providers outside the selected list.

Both the House and the Senate bills expand Medicare Select to all 50 States, the Senate bill makes it an 8½-year program, the House bill a 5-year program.

Therefore, I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on H.R. 483 be instructed to resolve the differences between the House and Senate bills—taking into account

the impact of the budget proposal, including Medicare Select cost increases that may result from increased beneficiary out-of-pocket costs and limitations on beneficiaries' choice of providers.

As Democrats, we should remain committed to protecting seniors from cuts that will drastically affect the Medicare Program and, more importantly, from increasing their out-of-pocket health care costs.

The Republican budget proposal adds \$3,500 to the out-of-pocket health care costs of each and every senior citizen over 7 years.

This translates to a back-door raid on Social Security. By 2002, nearly 50 percent of every senior citizen's cost-of-living adjustment in Social Security will go to pay for the increased cost in Medicare.

We cannot let that happen.

We should also preserve seniors' traditional right to choose their own health care and their own doctors.

The Republican's budget proposal will have serious consequences for every aspect of the Medicare Program, including Medicare Select. Therefore, we must act to protect all seniors and take these critical issues into account.

I urge all Members to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees. Presently, we will be going to a conference with the other body on a bill which extends the Medicare Select Program in the Medicare Program. Medicare Select is a particular type of MediGap policy which allows seniors to choose a Medicare benefits package modeled on a preferred provider delivery system of health care. The Medicare Select policy allows seniors to buy a less expensive MediGap insurance policy which wraps around the traditional Medicare benefit. It represents the new wave of innovative managed care delivery options that the private sector is currently using to hold down the rise in health care costs. Let us remember that for those elderly who choose a MediGap policy it is one of 11 options currently available.

This conference needs only to resolve the difference between the two bills on two elements—the length of the extension of the program, and whether or not a GAO study will be done. Those are the only outstanding issues.

But this motion to instruct is attempting to tie the extension of the Medicare Select Program to the recently passed House budget resolution. The House budget resolution is only binding on authorizing committees in terms of meeting aggregate budget numbers in entitlements and other programs. In terms of Medicare, it is the authorizing committees which will determine the policies that will meet budget targets. That is a process that will occur months from now in budget reconciliation. Therefore, at this point

in time it is impossible to determine the effect of a future event on a current conference. Therefore, this motion to instruct seems to be based on a belief by my Democratic colleagues in their ability to use crystal balls and psychics to divine the future.

I urge my colleagues to use the conference to resolve our differences quickly so that medicare select can be extended before its June 30 sunset date. If we do not, the only losers will be the hundreds of thousands of Medicare recipients who are currently in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to talk about billions and jillions and resolutions that are going to come. However, when we are talking about the future, I am concerned about the future of just one person like Henrietta Carter in Austin, TX, who writes me of a friend who she says just cannot afford health insurance now, "so she suffers a lot, because Medicare doesn't take care of her doctor visits and she has nothing to help with medication. She fell and cut a large gash in her leg but refused to go to the doctor because she was afraid she couldn't pay. There are days we know she is hurting, but she just keeps on." That is the kind of individual I am concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would raise the name of a constituent from my district, Martha Haircrow, from Charleston, who talked recently about the medical problems she is having and the great concern that she has about Medicare to meet that challenge. The argument here is that this is a narrow bill. It simply deals with medicare select. The irony of that is, let us take a look at the alphabet, 26 letters. However, if we take two letters out and fool around with them, we can greatly change the complexion of the alphabet. Therefore, we ought to be looking at Medicare and what is going to be happening to it in toto.

I understand why some do not want to do it. It has 300 billion dollars' worth of cuts that were mandated in the budget resolution that passed out of this House that many of the people on the other side of the aisle supported. It is \$3,500 more of out-of-pocket expenses. The part B premium, that is the monthly premium that seniors pay every month, will shoot up sharply as a result of these budget cuts, the Medicare cuts.

The irony to this, of course, is that at a time when Medicare part B premiums will be going up, the same budget resolution mandated a change in the cost-of-living adjustment so that the monthly cost-of-living adjustment that seniors receive will be going down; less

money coming in, more money being paid out of pocket. It is a sure prescription for real problems to every senior citizen.

There will be more copayments, there will be more deductibles paid out of pocket, more cost increases, no assurance that some of the programs that many of us pushed for last year in restructuring Medicare, such as outpatient prescription medications, the beginnings of long-term care, that they will be dealt with. Therefore, what is going to happen is that there will be a bit here done and a bit there done, but avoiding the entire picture.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how we can legislate Medicare select in a vacuum. Indeed, if medicare select is going to be the wave of the future for Medicare, then we have to have all of the Medicare cuts that this body approved and that the Republican leadership supported and pushed through. They have to be on the table as well.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to point out that this program is not a new program. It has been in 15 States. It serves 450,000 people. Last year, of all of those 450,000 people, there were but 9 complaints.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, if anybody tuned in and listened to the arguments on the other side of the aisle, they would think that this was a free for all debating here on any subject that any Member wanted to speak on. In fact, that is not the case. What is in front of us is a motion to instruct conferees. The House passed 408 to 14 a measure to extend Medicare Select. Medicare Select is a so-called MediGap. It is one of those insurance policies available to folk to create a whole package around part A and part B Medicare. There are currently 10 MediGap insurance type policies that have been approved by the Department of Health and Human Services. Medicare select is simply an 11th offering.

It says, instead of the traditional structure, you may go out into a network to get this wrap-around health care package. That is all it is. That is all it ever was. That is all it is ever going to be. It is simply the 11th, the addition to 10 other small programs.

What the minority is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is argue the entire Medicare issue on their motion to instruct. What a bizarre motion to instruct. It says that "will be instructed to resolve the differences between the House 8½ year extension and the Senate 5-year extension of Medicare Select policies." Eight and one-half years, 5 years? The House bill that was passed said extend it for 5 years. The Senate bill that was passed said extend it for 18 months. Extension in the unabridged dictionary right over here says "An additional period of time from the current time;"

adding time, an extension. Where in the world the Democrats got 8½ years and 5 years as extensions is beyond me.

□ 1020

But that is what they say here.

In addition, to make this motion germane, they say the scope of the conference, but what they really want to do is talk about the large program of Medicare. They do not offer specific proposals to fix Medicare that the trustees of the trust fund said is going broke in 7 years. No. They do not offer constructive alternatives. They stand up and complain. What a whimpering group the Democrats have been reduced to in this House.

Where are your ideas? Where are your alternative proposals to what we are offering? This is a simple motion to instruct conferees about extending a program that is currently in 15 States, very high success rate, to allow any of the 50 States to participate in the program. For how long? 5 years.

And guess what? After that 5-year period, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has to come to the Congress and say that this program has not resulted in savings, that those enrolled in Medicare Select policies are not provided with comparable coverage, and if that is the case, we do away with it. But if they are provided with comparable coverage, if it does provide savings, then we are going to go ahead and continue the program.

That is what this debate is about. A bill that passed 408 to 14 and by unanimous vote in the Senate, are we going to extend this modest little program?

I want Members to listen to this side of the aisle during this debate on what is supposed to be a motion to instruct. They are going to throw all kinds of garbage to scare the seniors about what is going to happen to the Medicare Program. I will tell you what is going to happen. If we listen to them and do nothing, the Medicare Program is going to go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans as the majority are going to offer constructive alternatives which will not only make sure that the program does not go bankrupt but it creates real choice in today's health care market like a modest little program called Medicare Select.

When we listen to the stories over here, it is going to be about making political hay, not about the program that the House and the Senate are going to reconcile their differences over to give seniors one small additional choice in the arsenal of making sure they have adequate health care protection.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about whimpering, this is a picture of what Republicans have told us and told American seniors they are going to do on the floor of this House. It is a total blank. That is whimpering. Had it not been for reporters, had it not been for the American Association of Retired

Persons exploring these secret task force memos, we would not know a thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am almost amused when I hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, "Don't let the Democrats frighten the elderly." Then they go talk about how the trust fund is going to go bankrupt and they are going to save Medicare.

The fact of the matter is when you look at the extent of the budget cuts that they are proposing in Medicare, it is far beyond anything to deal with the trust fund. It is going to devastate the Medicare Program.

That relates to the issue that is before us today. We need to focus on why we have MediGap policies and the Medicare Select policies.

We need these for one simple reason. Medicare requires people to pay a lot of money out of pocket right now when they get sick and use services. Most Medicare beneficiaries are so frightened by the amounts they will have to pay if they get sick that they take out a supplemental insurance policy to protect themselves.

Yet in this budget resolution that was adopted by my Republican colleagues in the House last week, people on Medicare are going to have to pay a lot more money than they already do out of their own pockets. Their MediGap premiums are going to soar, whether they try to economize by using Medicare Select or not, or if they decide they cannot afford the premium for a supplemental policy any longer, they are going to run the liability of having to pay very high cost-sharing amounts.

Medicare is not a program giving a lot of wealthy people a free ride, contrary to what some of our Republican friends try to use as a characterization. Most Medicare beneficiaries have modest incomes of \$25,000 a year or less. They already pay a hefty deductible of \$716 if they have to go to a hospital. They pay a part B premium to get coverage for physician services which is already \$550 a year. They have a \$100 deductible and coinsurance on these services.

Mr. Speaker, if they really get sick, they can exhaust their coverage entirely. On top of that, they have no coverage for prescription drugs, and only Medicaid to rely on if they have to go into a nursing home. It is no wonder they end up paying on the average something like \$840 in premiums for MediGap coverage.

What is the answer of my Republican colleagues? To ask them to pay more. The AARP has estimated the average Medicare beneficiary will pay something like \$3,500 more out of pocket over the next 7 years if the changes in

the House budget, the requirements that the Republicans are looking at, go into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insert my full statement in the RECORD, but I wanted to take this time to point out that what really is going on is what people are now paying is only a small portion of what they are going to have to pay if the Republican budget goes through.

Mr. Speaker, as the House goes to conference with the Senate to determine the period during which Medicare Select products can be marketed, it is important to focus on why we have MediGap policies, and Medicare Select policies.

We need these policies for one simple reason: Medicare requires people to pay a lot of money out-of-pocket when they get sick and use services. Most Medicare beneficiaries are so frightened by the amounts they will have to pay if they get sick that they take out a supplemental insurance policy to protect themselves.

And yet, in the budget resolution my Republican colleagues passed in the House last week, people on Medicare are going to have to pay a lot more.

Their MediGap premiums will soar—whether they try to economize by using Medicare Select or not—or, if they decide they cannot afford the premium for a supplemental policy any longer, they will risk liability for very high cost-sharing amounts.

Medicare is not a program giving a lot of wealthy people a free ride. Most Medicare beneficiaries have modest incomes of \$25,000 or less. They already pay a hefty deductible of \$716 if they have to go into the hospital. They pay a part B premium to get coverage for physician services which is nearly \$550 a year. They have a \$100 deductible and coinsurance on those services.

If they get really sick, they can exhaust their coverage entirely. And on top of all that, they have no coverage for prescription drugs, and only Medicaid to rely on if they have to go into a nursing home.

It is no wonder they end up paying on the average something like \$840 in premiums for MediGap coverage.

And what is the answer of my Republican colleagues? To ask them to pay more. The AARP has estimated that the average Medicare beneficiary will pay something like \$3,500 more out of pocket over these next 7 years if the changes this House budget requires go into effect.

People who try to protect themselves with MediGap insurance will find that their MediGap premiums are going to skyrocket. That is going to take money out of the pockets of Medicare beneficiaries just as surely as a tax increase.

And people who decide to get their coverage through a Medicare Select policy will find they are faced by very large cost-sharing obligations if they choose a physician that is not covered by their plan. Exercising their right to choose a physician is going to be an expensive one.

Every Medicare beneficiary is going to have to pay more cost-sharing or higher MediGap premiums, whatever their economic circumstances. Even if they are struggling along with just their Social Security check to support them.

And the poorest of our elderly will suffer the most. Today, Medicaid pays their premium for

Medicare, and helps them pay their cost-sharing. But once Medicaid is gone, and we have capped the Federal dollars we spend on that program, that help will not be there any longer.

And let me also note something else that will not be there once Medicaid becomes a block grant—the assurance of nursing home care for those who need it and cannot afford it. Once again, the middle-class American family is going to have to struggle with paying \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year for their elderly parent's nursing home care.

This budget is bad for you if you are old or you are sick. Medicare and Medicaid coverage will be less—and it is not enough today. A more expensive Medicare Select or other MediGap policy will not be an answer.

This bill on which the House goes into conference today is of minor significance in the light of the changes the budget resolution will mean for the Medicare Program. And that is the issue that should be on the minds of our House conferees as they meet with our colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] has the right to open and also the right to close.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct the conferees with regard to the conference on the Medicare Select Program. The instruction is virtually incomprehensible. It states that the conferees must resolve the differences between the two bills in light of changes in Medicare contemplated in this year's budget process.

Medicare Select is a very simple program: It is simply a demonstration project for a preferred provider network under MediGap policies, the private insurance policies that are designed to fill in specific gaps in the Medicare benefits structure such as deductibles, copayments, and services not covered by the Medicare Program. It is just another MediGap option available to Medicare beneficiaries. The authority for the Medicare Select Program is due to expire at the end of June. The extension of this program has absolutely nothing to do with the budget process we are currently engaged in. In fact, the program is not designed to, nor has it, reduced Medicare costs to the Federal Government. It merely is of help to the seniors.

This motion to instruct is asking the conferees to consider the Medicare Select Programs in light of this year's budget process. This effort makes no sense since: First, it is imperative that the conference on Medicare Select be completed before the end of June when the authority for the program expires; second, the budget resolution which

just passed the House has a September reporting date for the committees of jurisdiction to act on Medicare; and third, the budget resolution must be conferred with the Senate budget resolution, which has not yet been passed.

It seems that the real purpose of this motion to instruct is to once again try to steer us away from the seriousness of the task ahead of us: To ensure that the Medicare Program is preserved for current and future beneficiaries. I should not have to remind Members that the trustees for the Medicare hospital insurance and supplementary medical insurance trust funds are facing significant financial problems in both the short term and the long term.

Under the best estimates of the trustees, the hospital insurance trust fund will be exhausted by 2002. In short, the hospital insurance side of the program will not be able to pay its bills because of exploding part A expenditures. Part A is described by the trustees as a program "severely out of financial balance."

Not only is the HI trust fund financially out of balance, but spending growth by the supplementary medical insurance [SMI] trust fund is also a concern because the SMI rate of growth is unsustainable. SMI cost growth directly affects Medicare beneficiary part B premiums as well as general revenues from which the largest share of SMI costs are financed.

In 1995, premiums paid by enrollees will finance only about 28 percent of annual costs, according to the 1995 trustees' report. Over the next decade, the contribution from general revenues to the SMI trust fund will increase from \$46 billion in 1995 to \$151 billion in 2004, for an average annual growth rate of over 14 percent.

We are deeply concerned about the future of the Medicare Program. We strongly believe any solution to this crisis must be addressed in a bipartisan manner and we are disappointed by the administration's repeated refusal to join this effort. We are particularly alarmed that the President is ignoring the strongest possible warnings from the very individuals he appointed to safeguard the Medicare Program since 4 of 6 trustees are administration officials.

The end result of this instruction will be to put in jeopardy the MediGap policies of the 450,000 Medicare beneficiaries currently enrolled in Medicare Select plans. This program is very popular among senior citizens with good reason. In August 1994, Consumer Reports rated the top MediGap insurers nationwide. Eight out of ten of the top rated 15 MediGap plans were Medicare Select plans. During our Health Subcommittee hearing on Medicare Select, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners testified in favor of the program and stated that out of the 10 Medicare Select States that report into the NAIC's complaint data system,

there were only 9 Medicare Select complaints last year.

This instruction is simply a dilatory tactic and should be rejected. Members should think seriously before they cast a vote eliminating the Medicare Select Program.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Ways and Means, a Member of this house who has worked long and hard to try to protect our Medicare beneficiaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT EX- PANSION

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard today about ideas and proposals being proposed. But these same proponents of these ideas have put forth a budget that destroys children in this country, destroys clean air, destroys safe water, reduces law enforcement, all in the name of providing tax cuts to the rich. All I can say is, please leave our seniors alone.

The gentleman who preceded me a few speakers ago in the well, who chairs the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Commerce, has already cut \$84 billion out of the trust fund for Medicare just to give tax cuts to the very rich. Do not help us anymore, Mr. Chairman. You have done enough harm already.

Medicare Select is nothing but a political payoff to big insurance companies. Prudential Life Insurance Co. has already been convicted of stealing billions of dollars from seniors. Golden Rule Insurance Co. is under more litigation with State insurance commissioners than any other insurance company in the country. The staff who drafted this silly bill was paid hundreds of thousands of dollars by the insurance industry last year, and they are telling you they are here to help seniors?

Mr. Speaker, do not believe that. They have already cut \$3,000 out of seniors' pockets by changing the taxes that they will pay, to pay for their silly budget which is designed only to give tax cuts to the rich.

So, yes, let us balance the budget, let us help kids become healthy, let us have education and a clean environment, but do not louse up Medicare with silly ideas that are untried, that are just a payoff to the major insurance companies in this country, that will do nothing but deny medical benefits to the seniors who are already happy with their health care. This is

free enterprise to pay off Republican campaign contributions run amok.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], the prime author of this legislation.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct conferees. We have 35 days left before this program expires. We have 20 legislative days left before this program expires.

The preceding speaker talked about this being a payoff to big insurance companies. It is absolutely true that insurance companies are in the business of providing insurance, and that people buy insurance voluntarily and because they value it, because it gives them some security in their lives.

My interests and my concern is not the insurance companies. My interests and my concern are the seniors of America, the people. And people who buy Medicare Select policies are getting more health care at a lower cost. That is why they buy Medicare Select policies rather than some other MediGap policy.

In some instances the premiums are 40 percent less. If you are living on a fixed income, Mr. Speaker, that matters. Not only are the premiums less, but they get coverage for annual medicals, sometimes for pharmaceuticals, prescription medications, for some vision, some dental.

People are buying these policies voluntarily, and because they offer them more at a cheaper price. Our job is not to steer seniors in this market. Our job is only to assure that there is a market that offers choice.

The Medicare Select policies are regulated exactly like every other MediGap policy. These policies are not out there in the market with any less government oversight than any other MediGap policy.

□ 1040

So let us get on with this conference, let us make sure that this option for seniors in America that offers more health care for less dollars does not expire, let us try this time to meet our responsibilities, to renew the law without a gap.

Let me just add one other comment. My colleagues on the other side have said that we are cutting Medicare, and somehow we should not renew this program because we are cutting Medicare.

Now remember, it is the trustees, that is the Secretary of HHS, the Secretary of Labor, other members of the President's Cabinet who are saying Medicare is going bankrupt, it goes broke next year. That means it takes in less than it is going to pay out and it goes bankrupt, that means it eats all of its assets in 6 more years. So it is not the Republicans who are saying this. It is the Republicans who are saying we are going to do something about it, we are going to protect seniors in America, preserve Medicare. Under no,

no scenario are we cutting spending. In fact, Medicare in the last 7 years for seniors in America spent out \$844 million. In the next 7 years if we reform Medicare to serve seniors it will pay out \$1.6 billion, almost twice as much.

So, the figures are simply there. We are going to increase spending on Medicare and we are going to increase the amount we spend per beneficiary, not only more beneficiaries but per beneficiary, and we are going to do it in a way that will provide seniors better quality health care.

Let us not mix debates here. Let us focus this debate on simply preserving a right, a choice for seniors in America, preserving their access to a plan that offers in the 15 States it is available more health care benefits at a lower cost.

This is only about preserving existing choice for seniors, existing access to cost-effective care, and I urge the body, remember, almost everyone in this body voted for this bill when it went through, so vote against the motion to recommit, to support timely action on behalf of America's seniors.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support providing Medicare beneficiaries with more choices, and that is why I worked with the previous speaker to back this legislation, the Medicare Select Program. It does provide more choice for seniors.

However, it is absolutely impossible to have this debate this morning and talk about choice and not talk about the budget that was recently passed on this floor.

The cold facts are that \$283 billion in Medicare reductions were contained in that budget and will increase premiums, copayments, and deductions, and that will leave seniors with a choice of what they spend their money on, their fixed-income money for many of them. That budget we passed drastically reduces Medicare reimbursement for doctors and hospitals because that is a fact. When you are reducing an increase by \$283 billion and as more and more doctors become unwilling to accept a Medicare assignment, we will reduce choice for seniors. Even though Select Medicare that we are talking about today increases the choice, the fact of the matter of the budget we recently passed decreases the choice.

Along with this, the budget would also address nursing care coverage. Once more, again, seniors will be faced with diminishing choices on how to cope with enormous costs.

I support Medicare Select because it provides more choice. Everybody in this body wanted to do this for the seniors. Unfortunately this legislation follows on the heels of a budget that could do more to limit choices for Medicare beneficiaries than any piece of legislation ever passed on this floor.

So yes, we are talking about two things, but the fact of the matter is

you cannot be in a vacuum when you talk about Medicare; it is too big and too important. And of course we are all going to differ, but the fact of the matter is, with the budget, choices will be limited.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct. It frankly puts the cart before the horse. This is an amendment to the current Medicare Program and wholly inappropriate to require the conferees to resolve differences in the context of contemplated changes to Medicare.

We all know the House-passed budget calls for reduction in the rate of growth of the Medicare Program. What we do not know, however, is how it will be achieved.

It is interesting to me that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] showed us a blank chart. You know what? The blank is in the White House, not in the House of Representatives.

The blank chart has been filled up with Republican ideas and I will tell you what, before we are through, we are going to have Medicare fixed, it is going to be a super program for all our seniors, and we are not trying to take away from the seniors. We are trying to help the seniors protect the program and make it something that will be viable in the future.

It is interesting also to note that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] both voted for this Medicare Select when it was passed on the floor by overwhelming vote. It is interesting to note that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] has now changed his mind. It makes one wonder how can you have convictions on anything and vote on the floor in a different manner.

Medicare is going broke. I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] has said that, all our speakers have said it, it is going broke in the year 2002, and there is no way that this Government can pay anyone over 65 once that trust fund is to zero. The bills will not be paid. That is why Medicare needs to be fixed and fixed in a hurry and that is our goal, our aim, and it has been transferred to a scare tactic for the seniors of this Nation. We are not trying to scare anybody, we are just telling you the facts. The President's own people reported that Medicare is broke, going broke, and we are going to fix it and we are going to make it a system that is viable for all Americans, forever I hope.

I would just like to add that as of October 1994, approximately 450,000 beneficiaries were enrolled in Medicare Select. While a majority are covered through Blue Cross/Blue Shield plans, approximately 50 companies offer Medicare Select products. Medicare beneficiaries are old and these policies save 10 to 37 percent in premiums over traditional fee-for-service MediGap poli-

cies. And in August 1994, Consumer Reports rated the top MediGap insurance nationwide; 8 out of the top rated 15 MediGap plans were Medicare Select.

Failure to pass this legislation will lead to higher premiums for enrollees and the potential withdrawal of insurers from the market, meaning our seniors in that case would not have a choice of plans.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we are here talking about Medicare Select at the same time the Republican leadership has passed a bill making unprecedented cuts to the Medicare and Medicaid Programs which will result in limited access to or complete elimination of rural health care. The cuts of \$250 billion by the Republicans are the deepest spending reductions in the 30-year history of the health industry for our senior citizens. In fact, Medicare cuts hurt not just seniors but everybody, including our small hospitals.

Nearly 10 million Medicare beneficiaries live in rural America where there is often only a single hospital in the county. These rural hospitals tend to be small and serve primarily Medicare patients. Significant cuts to the Medicare Program will force many rural hospitals to cut back on the services they offer, or they will have to turn to the taxpayers for assistance in order to survive.

Most significantly, these devastating cuts would force many rural hospitals to close their doors completely. This would mean that many of us will have no hospitals to turn to in a time of medical crisis. Medicare Select, coupled with the cuts, will require increasing the cost of not just Medicare, but also the Medicare Select policy, or the MediGap policy, no matter what we have.

It is projected that each of the 25 hospitals in my district in northern Michigan will lose an average of \$746 per Medicare patient in the year 2000. Medicare Select will not replace this lost revenue. Seniors will be forced to replace the lost revenue.

Meanwhile, Republicans have already voted to give a \$20,000 per year tax cut to the wealthiest 1.1 million Americans in this country. That is Medicare Select: A select few will benefit while the seniors will suffer.

It is imperative the people of northern Michigan have access to quality medical care. That is why I will continue to fight against the Medicare Select proposal. I will continue to fight against the Republican proposal to cut Medicare and Medicaid which is so devastating to Michigan hospitals.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Michigan has brought this resolution out on the floor, because it is absolutely timely for us to discuss this very

central issue. The Republicans are proposing 300 billion dollars' worth of tax cuts, mostly for the wealthy. And they are proposing 300 billion dollars' worth of reductions in Medicare, largely for the 83 percent of the elderly who have \$25,000 or less income per year.

Three hundred billion dollars' worth of tax cuts for the wealthy, 300 billion dollars' worth of cuts in Medicare over the next 7 years. Now you do not have to be Dick Tracy to figure out that the elderly are going to be paying for the tax cuts of the rich.

The only request that is made by this resolution is that the conferees look at this issue, and try to make a determination as they are looking at Medicare Select as to what other recommendations they should be making to this body in that context. I do not think that that is an unreasonable request at all at this time, and in fact for us not to discuss it is to avoid, ignore the single most pressing issue on us, which is whether or not we should give this \$300 billion to the wealthy as we are taking it away from the poorest and the most elderly in our country. That is what this whole debate is all about.

Back in 1981 David Stockman on this floor tried to harness voluminous amounts of information to defend a knowingly erroneous premise. That erroneous premise was you could cut taxes for the wealthy, increase defense spending, and balance the budget simultaneously.

Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to point out in this debate today is that the Republicans who put together this proposal on the Committee on the Budget sent a letter to the chairman of our Subcommittee on Health, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], and in it they outlined various proposals that could be implemented in order to achieve the cuts in Medicare that many of the speakers have talked about today.

The options that exist in this document, I think there are 35 proposals, in my opinion limit choice rather than expand choice, and some of the speakers on the other side of the aisle today talked about how Medicare Select is going to provide more choices. The bottom line is if this budget resolution that the Republicans have passed is implemented, the choices, and by their own admission, the choices that are proposed in order to achieve these Medicare cuts are going to be less.

Let me give you an idea. One of the things that is discussed is increasing premiums for new beneficiaries who choose Medicare fee-for-service. One of the problems that my senior citizens are concerned about is that they do not want to be forced into managed-care systems when they prefer fee-for-service

where they can choose their own doctor or their own hospital. Although I think Medicare Select is good as an option, we do not want the situation to arise where the cost differential, if you will, between having a fee-for-service system where you can choose your own doctor or having to go into a managed-care system, where the cost differential is so great that in effect you are forced into a managed-care system. In effect, by increasing the premiums for new beneficiaries and saying it is going to cost more for a fee-for-service system, you are forcing a lot of people who have no choice into managed care, into HMO's, into not being able to choose their own doctor or their own hospital.

Another one of the proposals that is put forward by the House Republican budget is essentially to simply give people a voucher, \$5,100 a year, they give you a voucher and you can go out as a senior citizen and find whatever policy you can to pay for your health insurance. Think about how many senior citizens because of their disability, because of the problems that they have, how difficult is it for them to go out and shop around and get a health care policy.

The choices are being limited by these Republican proposals, and Medicare Select is not going to solve the problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, you know some of the speakers who were up here today talked about how overwhelmingly the House passed this Medicare Select extension. At the time that we passed that, we did not realize that the Republican budget that was going to come out was going to cut Medicare so deeply, cut Medicaid so deeply, and that the cuts in Medicare were going to be exactly reflective of the tax breaks that were going to be given to the wealthiest citizens of this country. That is the message that many of us are carrying here to the floor today. We did not know all of this back then, and when you take a look at the impact on your district and on your State, you begin to see that Medigap is truly the gap, the credibility gap, the Republican Party now has on the issue of Medicare, and that is why we have these concerns.

There will be some people on the other side who say we have not made cuts. Well, the fact of the matter is if you do not believe you have made cuts, talk to the CFO's at the hospitals, talk to the CEO's at the hospitals. In Pennsylvania we now know, and we met

with some of our CEO's and CFO's last week, many of them are Republicans, many of them are Democrats, but they share one message, 54 hospitals across the State of Pennsylvania, because of the cuts that the Republicans are planning, 54 hospitals across our State are on the critical list. Forty thousand health care workers across the State of Pennsylvania could lose their jobs; 348,000 citizens in the State of Pennsylvania alone will be risking not having direct access to hospitals, when and if many of these hospitals are forced to close.

You see many of these hospitals get as much as 60 percent or more of the funds that they take in from Medicare. That money will not be there in those amounts right now, and so when you start talking about Medicare Select, when you start talking about making up the difference, there is going to be a lot more of a difference to make up.

One in five citizens across the State of Pennsylvania happens to be on Medicare; one in six of them happen to be senior citizens. Many of our senior citizens in a State that has the largest rural population in this entire Nation, many of our citizens are on both Medicare and Medicaid because they are elderly and they are poor.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], representing Oberlin and environs.

□ 1100

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is an old country and western song that goes, "She got the gold mine, and I got the shaft." Republicans want to give the gold mine to wealthy special interests and give the shaft to America's elderly, \$300 billion in tax breaks, \$300 billion in cuts in Medicare.

The Republicans indignantly cry that these are not really cuts, they are only slowing the growth in Medicare. Tell that to the literally millions of Medicare people in Ohio and Pennsylvania and California and all over this country who will have \$3,500 more taken out of their pocket over the next 7 years in higher premiums, in deductibles, in copayments. Tell those people these are not really cuts.

These are cuts in services. These cuts in services are to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, tax breaks for special interests, tax breaks for people that really do not read those kinds of tax breaks, the highest income people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I support Medicare Select because it provides choice, but as Republicans move to make these cuts in Medicare, what they are talking about is rationing health care, and what they are talking about is taking away physician choice.

We should reject that, Mr. Speaker. We should reject that kind of thinking. It is not good for America's elderly. It is not good for the American people overall.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, well, I guess we are not going to talk about the motion to instruct. Obviously, that was not the reason you offered what purportedly is a motion to instruct conferees.

The factual information in the motion to instruct is simply wrong. There is no instruction in the motion to instruct. It simply says that you want to talk about what is going on in this year's budget process. That is what the motion to instruct says.

So, if you do not want to talk about your motion to instruct, and I am quite sure you do not expect it to pass because it would be rather bizarre to pass a motion to instruct that has no instructions to the conferees, so what you really want to do is talk about the issue of Medicare, and you want to talk about the issue of Medicare in terms of what Republicans are trying to do to make sure that the Medicare trust fund does not go bankrupt.

I think you need to remember that in April the trustees of the health insurance trust fund, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, Secretary of Labor, all President Clinton's appointees to the Board of Trustees, said if we do nothing, if we do nothing, Medicare goes bankrupt in 2002.

What Republicans are proposing to do is take the \$4,700 that is spent on each senior today and grow that to \$6,400 in 2002. If we can do that, if we can accomplish an increase in the program at that rate, we save Medicare from bankruptcy.

The Democrats have had some difficulty in understanding that concept. I want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] because the gentlewoman from Connecticut said it right. What we are talking about is reducing the increase. The job for all of us is to create a Medicare which has more choice for seniors, which grows in the amount that is available, but that fundamentally makes sure the program does not go bankrupt.

You have heard the word "cut" over here from virtually every speaker. It is a word that is somewhat pejorative, that is loaded, that is a political term that they want to use. They cannot deny themselves the use of the term "cut." The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], to her commendable credit, did not say "cut," because she knows it is not a cut. It is a reduction in the increase, and, frankly, when you have increases going up at 10.5 and 11 percent a year in an old 1960's bill-paying structure, when today's marketplace is half that, taxpayers should want us to make sure that we get the savings from the marketplace in the Medicare Program. That is what we propose to do.

And we are looking for people to join us in the effort to save Medicare. I did not hear one person on this floor today talk about joining in the effort to save Medicare.

But I want this voice to be heard on the floor. I want my Democrat colleagues and friends to listen carefully to the words of this individual. This is what he said: "Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut." Repeat, "That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut."

So when you hear all of this business about cuts, let me caution you that is not what is going on. Who said that? William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States and a Democrat. He believes we have to reduce the rate of increase, just as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] said. We have to reduce the rate of increase.

What we are proposing is to reduce the rate of increase. What President Clinton has said must be done, what he believes should be done is to reduce the rate of increase. How we do that is going to be a very, very positive exercise as we open up a 1960's fee-for-service bill-paying bureaucracy to all of the exciting changes that are going on out there in the health care world, one very small, modest change that has been a pilot program for 3 years, called Medicare Select, that has almost a half million folks in that program, with only nine complaints to date.

It is a program that we want to continue for a 5-year period. We have told the Secretary of Health and Human Services, "Keep an eye on that program. If it does not do what it is supposed to do, that is, increase choice and save money, we will sunset the program. We will come up with another idea." Right now what we need are new ideas, not the same old arguments, new ideas.

Medicare Select is a promising new idea. We want to send the program to the 50 States who want to join it. The States voluntarily take up the program. It is not imposed upon them. People voluntarily buy their insurance. It is not imposed upon them. It is a slightly different way of doing business in the insurance and health care area. We want to see if it has some promise.

We are going to try some other ideas. We are going to bring the sunshine from the outside, the positive reduction in expenses from the outside, into this archaic system, by choice. Republicans are going to do that. We would really love to have our Democratic colleagues join their President in reducing the increase in positive ways.

Instead, what you hear is pure political propaganda. They do not want to talk about Medicare Select.

I will tell you, you just heard a number of Democrats come to the microphone, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], the

gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], they all voted for the Medicare Select measure when it left here, 408 to 14.

This is a good idea. What you have here today on the part of the Democrats is an exercise largely in futility. They are now the minority party. They do not get to ram proposals down people's throats by pure quantitative measures because they have more votes than someone else. We are asking them to come to the table with your ideas. Let us hear them.

Over the next several months there is going to be a feeding frenzy of ideas in the Health Subcommittee of Ways and Means and Health Subcommittee of Commerce. We are going to put together a proposal that will make sure the Medicare trust fund will not go broke, that seniors will have a better choice, we will grow the Medicare Program from today's \$4,700 to \$6,400 for every American. We will save the program.

This is a modest beginning. Vote down the motion to instruct, which instructs nothing, and let us get on with change.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-130) on the resolution (H. Res. 156) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561), to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT EXPANSION

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the facts from this debate are clear. The Democrats want to see that the discussions in the conference will address the proposed cuts in Medicare benefits. That is all we want.

The hard fact is that senior citizens of this country are going to take a \$300 billion hit on their Medicare costs and

that \$300 billion hit is going to be used to finance a tax cut for the well-to-do.

Now, I can understand how my Republican colleagues get outraged about this. One of my colleagues from California quoted the President telling that Medicare is in trouble. Everybody has known Medicare was in trouble. The President tried to do something about it last year, and his comments of last year, quoted on this floor by the previous Member who addressed this body, simply said Medicare is in trouble unless you pass his universal health care coverage program. Every single Republican opposed that. Everybody knows health care in this country is in trouble. Everybody knows health care costs in this country are escalating at an excessive rate. Everybody knows that availability of insurance and the affordability of insurance is declining.

We can talk about innovation and innovativeness and everything else, and a feeding frenzy of innovation that is supposed to take place. In the health care subcommittee, run by the gentleman from California, there has been no excessive innovation or anything of that kind going on in his committee and certainly nothing vaguely resembling a feeding frenzy of innovation, certainly no sign of innovation in his committee, nothing except cuts for the senior citizens, give a tax break to the rich and talk about how the Democrats are responsible for the problem.

The real problem began last year in this Congress and the year before when the Republicans refused to a man to consider any reform in health care overall which would not only have addressed the problem of Medicare and its viability but also every other health care program in this country which would have made health care available to every American and which would have seen to it that the costs of health care for business, for industry, for government, and for the ordinary citizen would have gone back.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that this is a debate about MediGap, and indeed it is. It is a debate about whether or not these conferees will consider the realities of what has occurred on this House floor with reference to the cuts and the increases in out-of-pocket costs to Medicare recipients across this country. There is a giant MediGap, because another 30 minutes later all we have is a blank page from the Republican Party with reference to what they are going to do to seniors across this country.

They refuse to come to this floor and tell the people of America what the journalists have found, what the American Association of Retired Persons has found, that when a senior anywhere in this country reaches for their wallet to pay for the same level of health care, they are going to reach in and find it does not stretch as far as it used to, because their premiums, their deductible has been doubled, their premiums have

been raised, new out-of-pocket costs face them, and instead of MediGap, the kind of insurance we are going to need is medigorge, because a giant gorge is being created that will not be filled unless this instruction is approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 224, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

YEAS—197

Abercrombie	Ford	Meek
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Menendez
Andrews	Frost	Mfume
Baessler	Furse	Miller (CA)
Baldacci	Gejdenson	Mineta
Barcia	Gephardt	Minge
Barrett (WI)	Geren	Mink
Beilenson	Gibbons	Moakley
Bentsen	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Berman	Gordon	Montgomery
Bevill	Green	Moran
Bishop	Gutierrez	Murtha
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Borski	Hall (TX)	Neal
Boucher	Hamilton	Oberstar
Brewster	Harman	Obey
Browder	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Brown (CA)	Hayes	Ortiz
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Orton
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Owens
Bryant (TX)	Hinchey	Pallone
Cardin	Holden	Pastor
Chapman	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Clayton	Jackson-Lee	Payne (VA)
Clement	Jacobs	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Pickett
Collins (IL)	Johnson, E.B.	Pomeroy
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Poshard
Condit	Kanjorski	Rahall
Conyers	Kaptur	Rangel
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Reed
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Reynolds
Cramer	Kennelly	Richardson
Danner	Kildee	Rivers
de la Garza	Klink	Roemer
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rose
DeLauro	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Laughlin	Rush
Deutsch	Levin	Sabo
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dingell	Lincoln	Sawyer
Dixon	Lofgren	Schroeder
Doggett	Lowe	Schumer
Dooley	Luther	Scott
Doyle	Maloney	Serrano
Durbin	Manton	Sisisky
Edwards	Markey	Skaggs
Engel	Martinez	Skelton
Eshoo	Mascara	Slaughter
Evans	Matsui	Spratt
Farr	McCarthy	Stark
Fattah	McDermott	Stenholm
Fields (LA)	McHale	Stokes
Filner	McKinney	Studds
Flake	McNulty	Stupak
Foglietta	Meehan	Tanner

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns

Traficant
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)

Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—224

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt
Archer	Frisa	Neumann
Armey	Funderburk	Ney
Bachus	Ganske	Norwood
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Oxley
Baker (LA)	Gilchrest	Packard
Ballenger	Gillmor	Parker
Barr	Gilman	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Petri
Bartlett	Goodling	Pombo
Barton	Goss	Porter
Bass	Graham	Portman
Bateman	Greenwood	Pryce
Bereuter	Gunderson	Quillen
Billbray	Gutknecht	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hancock	Radanovich
Bliley	Hastert	Ramstad
Blute	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Boehlert	Hayworth	Riggs
Boehner	Hefley	Roberts
Bonilla	Heineman	Rogers
Bono	Herger	Rohrabacher
Brownback	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TN)	Hobson	Roth
Bunn	Hoekstra	Roukema
Bunning	Hoke	Royce
Burr	Horn	Salmon
Burton	Hostettler	Sanford
Buyer	Houghton	Saxton
Callahan	Hunter	Scarborough
Camp	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Canady	Hyde	Schiff
Castle	Inglis	Seastrand
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Jones	Shaw
Christensen	Kasich	Shays
Chrysler	Kelly	Shuster
Clinger	Kim	Skeen
Coble	King	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (TX)
Combest	Knollenberg	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Kolbe	Solomon
Cox	LaHood	Souder
Crane	Largent	Spence
Crapo	Latham	Stearns
Creameans	LaTourette	Stockman
Cunningham	Lazio	Stump
Davis	Leach	Talent
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Tate
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Thomas
Dickey	Linder	Thornberry
Doolittle	Lipinski	Tiahrt
Dornan	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Dreier	Longley	Upton
Duncan	Lucas	Vucanovich
Dunn	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Ehlers	Martini	Walker
Ehrlich	McCollum	Walsh
Emerson	McCrery	Wamp
English	McDade	Watts (OK)
Ensign	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McInnis	Weldon (PA)
Ewing	McIntosh	Weller
Fawell	McKeon	White
Fields (TX)	Metcalfe	Whitfield
Flanagan	Mica	Wicker
Foley	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Forbes	Molinar	Young (AK)
Fowler	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Fox	Morella	Zeliff
Franks (CT)	Myers	Zimmer
Franks (NJ)	Myrick	

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Gallegly	Meyers
Calvert	Hansen	Nussle
Clay	Istook	Peterson (FL)
Cubin	Klecza	
Fazio	Livingston	

□ 1135

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. BECERRA for, with Mrs. CUBIN against.

Mr. COBURN and Mr. KIM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. WATERS and Mr. SCHUMER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLILEY, BILIRAKIS, HASTERT, ARCHER, and THOMAS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. DINGELL, WAXMAN, GIBBONS, and STARK.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 571

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 571. The gentlemen misunderstood the substance of that bill, and we have agreed to remove them as cosponsors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING PRE-FILING REQUIREMENT FOR AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on National Security ordered reported H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996. The Rules Committee plans to meet during the week of June 5 to grant a rule for the bill which is scheduled for floor consideration during the week of June 12.

The Rules Committee expects to report the traditional structured rule making in order only amendments prefiled with our committee.

Members who wish to offer amendments to the bill should submit 55 copies of their amendments, together with and a brief explanation, to the Rules Committee office at H-312 of the Capitol, no later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 6.

Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the National Security Committee. Copies of the committee substitute will be available for examination by Members and staff in the offices of the committee at 2120 Rayburn House Office Building.

Members are advised to use the Office of Legislative Counsel to draft their amendments.

If Members or their staff have any questions regarding this procedure, they should contact David Lonie of our staff at extension 5-7985. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in submitting their amendments by the 5 p.m., June 6 deadline in properly drafted form.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES
Washington, DC, May 25, 1995.

PRE-FILING REQUIREMENT FOR AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL (H.R. 1530)

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Rules Committee plans to meet during the week of June 5th to grant a rule for the National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1530) which is scheduled for floor consideration during the week of June 12th.

The Rules Committee expects to report the traditional structured rule making in order only amendments pre-filed with our Committee. Members who wish to offer amendments to the bill should submit 55 copies of their amendments, together with a brief explanation, to the Rules Committee office at H-312 of the Capitol, no later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 6th.

Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the National Security Committee. Copies of the Committee substitute will be available for examination by Members and staff in the offices of the Committee at 2120 Rayburn House Office Building. Members are requested to use the Office of Legislative Counsel to draft their amendments.

If Members or their staff have any questions regarding this procedure, they should contact David Lonie of our staff at Extension 5-7985. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in submitting their amendments by the 5 p.m., June 6th deadline in properly drafted form.

Sincerely,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING ADDITIONAL TIME FOR DEBATE ON AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1561, THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to be absolutely clear why we are providing additional time after the recess to consider H.R. 1561 the American Overseas Interests Act. It is because so many amendments are still pending and because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle requested additional time for them.

The rule accompanying H.R. 1561 provided for 2 hours of general debate and 10 for amendments that were preprinted in the RECORD. Any remaining amendments would be considered under a 10-minute time limit, with all debate to conclude by 2:30 this afternoon.

As of last night—100 amendments had been filed—58 by Republicans and 42 Democrats. When the Committee rose yesterday, we had consumed 9 of the 10

hours of debate and had disposed of nine amendments—six Republican and three Democrat.

Of the 91 amendments remaining—51 are Republican and 39 are Democratic amendments. It is to accommodate those Members with remaining amendments that we are proposing an additional 6 hours of debate when we return from the recess.

Reports that we yanked H.R. 1561 because the bill is in trouble are just plain wrong. We are acting to provide more time to consider this very important measure that deals with our foreign policy agencies and programs.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think it makes sense. We have a large number of amendments pending, and I think it makes sense to have some modicum of debate. Am I to assume that the committee will be recommending to the Committee on Rules when we come back in a week-and-a-half a time limit on these amendments, or will it be staying under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. GILMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from California, that we have already reported a rule about an hour ago which does provide for 6 hours of additional time under the 5-minute rule, yes.

Mr. BERMAN. So essentially there is no time limit on any individual amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would just say to the chairman of the Committee on International Relations that if there were going to be any time limitations on amendments, it would have to be negotiated between both sides of the aisle. That is to be expected.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one further question, is the plan to bring this rule to the floor on Wednesday, June 7?

Mr. GILMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Is it the plan to then move, assuming that rule passes, to the 6 hours remaining of debate on Wednesday, June 7?

Mr. GILMAN. It is my understanding we would be able to then move to consider the 6 hours of remaining debate.

Mr. BERMAN. Are the amendments limited to the amendments that have been printed in the RECORD as of today?

Mr. GILMAN. That is my understanding. Only the amendments that have been printed in the RECORD as of yesterday.

Mr. BERMAN. Does it include a managers' amendment?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes it would be included.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Wednesday, May 24, and was not present for two recorded votes on the bill, H.R. 1561. I wish to have it included in the RECORD that had I been present, I would have vote "yes" on rollcall vote No. 354 and "no" on rollcall vote No. 353.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 1 minute in order to question the distinguished majority leader about the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader to ask about the schedule for next week and the week after.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me predicate my remarks about the coming schedule by making a few observations about the American Overseas Interests Act that we have had under consideration, and to provide some explanation for why we are holding the bill over to the week following.

□ 1145

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that without being too poetic, that it is bemusing how confusing it has been for so many people that a purely logistical decision, made out of consideration for the work requirements of the House and the desire to have full participation by the Members, has been written up in the newspapers as something that is completely different than in fact what it was.

Therefore, out of regard for this lack of understanding, let me just make these points. On this bill, we have 100 amendments filed. We considered nine amendments in 9 hours. Ninety-one were left to be considered, many to be en bloc. That is over 25 Members that have amendments left to be considered in the bill. By the time we finished last night we had only 35 minutes left under the existing rule. Those 25 Members deserve regard, Members from both sides of the aisle, on the bill.

We had thought yesterday at the time the decision was made that we would do not only the conference for Medicare Select, but that for the budget as well today. I was not prepared to take as much as 3½ hours away from our Members who might otherwise have had that time available for this bill. For that reason, I made the decision to hold the bill over, and to in fact, because time was available, increase the time available for those amendments, this done wholly in the spirit of our desire to include as many Members as possible on every bill as we can.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we made a decision to add from those amendments already printed in the RECORD the option, placed in the hands of the committee chairman, to have a chairman's amendment insofar as he may find an opportunity available to improve his bill. There was no consideration given to a doubt about the vote outcome. It was all done out of concern for the logistics of the House's business with this bill and other bills, and a desire to improve the participation opportunities for all our Members on both sides of the aisle.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the House will stand in adjournment through Monday, June 5. On Tuesday, June 6, the House will meet at 12 o'clock in a pro forma session. There will be no recorded votes on Tuesday. On Wednesday, June 7, the House will meet at 12 o'clock for legislative business. We plan to take up a rule governing further consideration of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act of 1995, and then complete consideration of that legislation and pass it that day. We then hope to complete three hatchery bills under rules previously adopted by the House. These bills are H.R. 614, the New London National Fish Hatchery Conveyance; H.R. 584, the Fairport National Fish Hatchery Conveyance; and H.R. 535, the Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance.

The House will meet at 10 o'clock a.m. on Thursday, June 8. It is our hope to have Members on their way home, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 8, it is our hope to have the Members on their way home to their families and their districts by 6 o'clock p.m. on that Thursday.

The House will not be in session on Friday, June 9.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to again note that we have these three fish hatchery bills. I know the gentleman's great interest in fishing, and I know that he wants these fish to be hatched as much as I do, so we are all looking forward to getting these three bills passed next week or the week after next.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I guess we cannot catch them and kiss them if we do not hatch them.

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is right. I know the gentleman is interested in doing that. Maybe the gentleman and I can figure out how to catch and throw back some of these fish.

Mr. Speaker, let me just simply report what the gentleman said, so Members who may not have been paying as close attention as they might will understand this. As I get it, we will not expect votes on Monday, Tuesday, or Friday of the week we get back from the Memorial Day recess.

Mr. ARMEY. That is right.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I understand the gentleman will be asking unanimous consent that the Committee on National Security will be allowed to file the Defense authorization bill during the recess. Would the gentleman tell us when he expects that important bill to be considered by the House?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we would hope to begin consideration the week following the week ending on June 9.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and wish him a prosperous, effective, and successful district work period.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I wish the same for him and all the Members of his party.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1995, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1995, OR UNTIL NOON ON THE SECOND DAY AFTER MEMBERS ARE NOTIFIED TO REASSEMBLE, AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1995, FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1995, OR SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1995, TO MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1995, OR UNTIL NOON ON THE SECOND DAY AFTER MEMBERS ARE NOTIFIED TO REASSEMBLE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 72) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 72

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 25, 1995, it stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, June 6, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 25, 1995, Friday, May 26, 1995, or Saturday, May 27, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, June 5, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 157) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 157

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Mr. HASTERT of Illinois, to rank following Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Committee on Resources: Mr. ENSIGN of Nevada.

Committee on Small Business: Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

Committee on Commerce: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, to rank following Mr. COX of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, June 6, 1995, the Speaker, and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, June 6, 1995, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, June 7, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, June 7, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together

with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Small Business.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to forward my second annual report on the state of small business, and to report that small businesses are doing exceptionally well. Business starts and incorporations were up in 1993, the year covered in this report. Failures and bankruptcies were down. Six times as many jobs were created as in the previous year, primarily in industries historically dominated by small businesses.

Small businesses are a critical part of our economy. They employ almost 60 percent of the work force, contribute 54 percent of sales, account for roughly 40 percent of gross domestic product, and are responsible for 50 percent of private sector output. More than 600,000 new firms have been created annually over the past decade, and over much of this period, small firms generated many of the Nation's new jobs. As this report documents, entrepreneurial small businesses are also strong innovators, producing twice as many significant innovations as their larger counterparts.

In short, a great deal of our Nation's economic activity comes from the record number of entrepreneurs living the American Dream. Our job in Government is to make sure that conditions are right for that dynamic activity to continue and to grow.

And we are taking important steps. Maintaining a strong economy while continuing to lower the Federal budget deficit may be the most important step we in Government can take. A lower deficit means that more savings can go into new plant and equipment and that interest rates will be lower. It means that more small businesses can get the financing they need to get started.

We are finally bringing the Federal deficit under control. In 1992 the deficit was \$290 billion. By 1994, the deficit was \$203 billion; we project that it will fall to \$193 billion in 1995.

Deficit reduction matters. We have been enjoying the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 25 years. Gross domestic product has increased, as have housing starts. New business incorporations continue to climb. We want to continue bringing the deficit down in a way that protects our economic recovery, pays attention to the needs of people, and empowers small business men and women.

CAPITAL FORMATION

One area on which we have focused attention is increasing the availability of capital to new and small enterprises, especially the dynamic firms that keep us competitive and contribute so much to economic growth.

Bank regulatory policies are being revised to encourage lending to small firms. Included in the Credit Availability Program that we introduced in 1993 are revised banking regulatory policies concerning some small business loans and permission for financial institutions to create "character loans."

New legislation supported by my Administration and enacted in September 1994, the Reigle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994, establishes a Community Development Financial Institutions Fund for community development banks, amends banking and securities laws to encourage the creation of a secondary market for small business loans, and reduces the regulatory burden for financial institutions by changing or eliminating 50 banking regulations.

Under the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1994, the Small Business Administration (SBA) is authorized to increase the number of guaranteed small business loans for the next 3 years. The budget proposed for the SBA will encourage private funds to be directed to the small businesses that most need access to capital. While continuing cost-cutting efforts, the plan proposes to fund new loan and venture capital authority for SBA's credit and investment programs. Changes in the SBA's 7(a) guaranteed loan program will increase the amount of private sector lending leveraged for every dollar of taxpayer funds invested in the program.

Through the Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) program, a group of new venture capital firms are expected to make available several billion dollars in equity financing for startups and growing firms. The SBIC program will continue to grow as regulations promulgated in the past year facilitate financing with a newly created participating equity security instrument.

And the Securities and Exchange Commission's simplified filing and registration requirements for small firm securities have helped encourage new entries by small firms into capital markets.

We are recommending other changes that will help make more capital available to small firms. In reauthorizing Superfund, my Administration seeks to limit lender liability for Superfund remediation costs, which have had an adverse effect on lending to small businesses. Interagency teams have been examining additional cost-effective ways to expand the availability of small business financing, such as new options for expanding equity investments in small firms and improvements to existing microlending efforts.

We've also recognized that we can help small business people increase their available capital through tax reductions and incentives. We increased by 75 percent, from \$10,000 to \$17,500, the amount a small business can deduct as expenses for equipment purchases. Tax incentives in the 1993 Budget Reconciliation Act are having their effect, encouraging long-term investment in small firms. And the empowerment zone program offers significant tax incentives—a 20 percent wage credit, \$20,000 in expensing, and

tax-exempt facility bonds—for firms within the zones.

REGULATION AND PAPERWORK

But increasing the availability of capital to small firms is only part of the battle. We also have to make sure that Government doesn't get in the way. And we're making progress in our efforts to create a smaller, smarter, less costly and more effective Government that is closer to home—closer to the small businesses and citizens it serves.

In the first round of our reinventing Government initiative—the National Performance Review—we asked Government professionals for their best ideas on how to create a better Government with less red tape. One recommendation was that Federal agency compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act—that requires agencies to examine proposed and existing regulations for their effects on small entities—be subject to judicial review. In other words, they said we need to put teeth in the legislation requiring Federal agencies to pay attention to small business concerns when they write regulations. That proposal has been under debate in the Congress.

Federal agencies are already considering and implementing specific ways to streamline regulations and make paperwork easier for small businesses to manage. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responded to small business owners and advocates who said that the agency's toxic release inventory rule was especially costly and burdensome. In November 1994, the EPA announced a final rule that will make it easier for small businesses to report small amounts of toxic releases.

And SBA has slashed the small business loan form for loans under \$100,000 from an inch-thick stack to a single page. The SBA is also piloting a new electronic loan application that will involve no paperwork, but will allow business owners to concentrate on the business at hand—building a successful operation.

When businesses are unable to succeed, no one is served by a process that entangles small business owners in an endless jumble of paperwork. Sweeping changes made to bankruptcy laws in the past year will help small businesses reorganize. Small firms with less than \$2.5 million in debt may utilize a streamlined reorganization process that is less expensive and more timely.

My Executive order on Regulatory Review provides a process for more rational regulation, and we've been listening to the concerns of small firms through a Regulatory Reform Forum for Small Business. Five sector-specific groups have made specific proposals for regulatory relief. These groups have said that a comprehensive, multi-agency strategy, with better public involvement, is probably the most cost-effective way to improve both the quality of regulations and compliance with them. The key is to make sure that

Government serves small business and the American people, not the other way around.

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

The reinventing Government initiative also called for expanded use of electronic marketing and commerce, and we have made great strides in providing information about Government programs electronically. These methods will increase small business access to markets.

Another area that has been sorely in need of reform is the Government procurement process. In October 1994, I signed into law the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act, which will change the way the Government does business. The law modifies more than 225 provisions of procurement law to reduce paperwork burdens, improve efficiency, save the taxpayers money, establish a Federal acquisition computer network, increase opportunities for women-owned and small disadvantaged businesses, and generally make Government acquisition of commercial products easier. This report documents how small businesses are doing under the old system; my hope is that opportunities for small business success will be even greater once these reforms are in effect.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Beyond encouraging an economic environment that supports small business success, opening doors to capital resources, buying more of our goods and services from small firms, and getting out of small business' way, I believe we in Government have a responsibility to ask whether we are doing enough to ensure a healthy and adequately prepared work force.

I remain committed to seeking a way to provide health insurance coverage for all Americans. As this report clearly shows, the number of uninsured Americans is too high—and it's growing. Millions of those citizens are in working families. And the sad fact is that many of those workers are in small businesses, which have seen their premiums and deductibles soar. We must make sure that self-employed people and small businesses can buy insurance at more affordable rates—whether through voluntary purchasing pools or some other mechanism.

We also ought to be able to ensure that our citizens are adequately provided for when they reach the end of their working years. Here too, small firms have been at a disadvantage. Our proposed pension legislation exempted most small plans from compliance and reporting increases.

And while our industries restructure and move from an age of heavy industry to an information age that demands new skills and new flexibility, we need to make sure that our work force has the skills and tools to compete. That is why I proposed the Middle Class Bill of Rights, which would provide a tax deduction for all education and training after high school; foster

more saving and personal responsibility by permitting people to establish an individual retirement account and withdraw from it tax-free for the cost of education, health care, first-time house buying, or the care of a parent; and offer to those laid off or working for a very low wage, a voucher worth \$2,000 a year to get the skills they need to improve their lives.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

We also want to empower small businesses to succeed in a global economy. One of the greatest challenges in the next century will be our international competition. Ninety-six percent of all exporting firms are small firms with fewer than 500 employees, but only 10 percent of small firms export; therefore the potential for increasing small firm exports is significant. I believe the North American Free Trade Agreement and the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade will benefit small firms interested in expanding into international markets in this hemisphere and beyond.

Lending to small exporters is being eased through reforms in the Export-Import Bank's Working Capital Guarantee Program. New one-stop export shops are moving in the right direction to assist small firms by providing access to export programs of the Department of Commerce, Export-Import Bank, and Small Business Administration all under one roof.

HEARING FROM SMALL BUSINESS

Small businesses are too important to our economy for their concerns not to be heard. That is why I have given the SBA a seat on the National Economic Council and invited the SBA Administrator in to Cabinet meetings.

Over the past 2 years, my Administration has been asking questions of small business owners and listening to the answers—seeking advice and guidance from a diverse audience of business leaders to determine the most critical problems and devise solutions that work.

This year presents a special opportunity for small business persons to make their concerns known at the White House Conference on Small Business, set to convene in Washington in June 1995. In State conferences leading up to the national conference, small business owners have been frank about their concerns. I look forward to hearing their small business action agenda.

I firmly believe that we need to keep looking to our citizens and small businesses for innovative solutions. They have shown they have the ingenuity and creative power to make our economy grow; we just need to let them do it.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 25, 1995.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

MEDICARE

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the debate on MediGap this morning, I am here today to make a plea on Medicare. Let us stop the demagoguery—let us roll up our sleeves and deal with the problem. The Medicare trustees have just reported to us that if we do nothing to save the system, the part A trust fund, the heart of the program starts to go broke next year and is bankrupt entirely in 7 short years—not unanticipated by those who have been following it closely—but sobering nonetheless.

Let us deal with it—and the sooner the better. The new CBO Director told us the obvious in recent testimony: "Any delay will require dramatic cuts and program changes in the future." If we start to reform the system now, I believe we can accomplish the twin goals of saving the program from bankruptcy and improving it through private sector innovation, expanded choice and cracking down on fraud. We can do it because, as President Clinton told the AARP in 1993, "Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. So when you hear all this business about cuts, let me caution you that that is not what is going on. We are going to have increases in Medicare and Medicaid, and a reduction in the rate of growth." Let us act now in a bipartisan manner before the problem gets out of hand.

The Medicare trustee report itself stated, "these programs are too important to be politicized and [we] urge that a highly professional, nonpartisan approach continue to be followed."

DON'T LET REPUBLICANS SLAM THE DOOR SHUT ON STAFFORD LOANS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the Republican budget proposal as it specifically relates to higher education. Yesterday, I talked about cuts in our elementary and secondary education funds that will hurt our children in public schools. Today, I am going to talk about the House proposal that will increase college costs for 4.5 million college students by eliminating the in-school interest subsidy on Stafford loans. Families who rely on Stafford student loans would pay up to \$3,000 more for the cost of a college education.

These extra costs could put a college education out of reach for many young people in my district. I have a picture

here of a young lady, Yuroba Harris. Yuroba is an honor student at the University of Houston. In order to earn extra money for books and tuition, she works in my district office part time, serving the constituents of the 29th District in Houston, TX.

Elimination of the in-school interest subsidy could put college out of reach for a lot of young people like Yuroba and other middle-class and poor young people all over my district. There is an old proverb: Give a person a fish and they will eat today. Teach them to fish and they will eat for a lifetime. Let us not cut education. Let us make sure they can eat for a lifetime.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICA'S FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, we have been debating the foreign aid bill for the last few days and we have heard a lot of criticisms about foreign aid programs. Some are justified and some are not, but undoubtedly some good things have been accomplished. I would like to include in the RECORD, following my remarks, a recent Cincinnati Post guest column written by my friend, Dan Radford, executive secretary-treasurer of the Cincinnati AFL-CIO Labor Council, who has had a very productive working relationship with the U.S. Information Agency.

Working under a grant from USIA, the AFL-CIO's Free Trade Union Institute has worked closely with trade union leaders from Ukraine and Kazakhstan. A delegation from those former Soviet States recently visited Cincinnati to get some positive exposure to our political and economic system, with the local labor council serving as host.

It is my hope that as we move toward a more streamlined and productive foreign policy apparatus, we will be able to work with groups like this and continue in a more efficient way to provide the means for such positive dialog.

I include the Radford article in the RECORD at this time as a valuable contribution to the discussion.

The text of the article is as follows:

LABOR UNIONS HELP NURTURE DEMOCRACIES IN EASTERN EUROPE

(By V. Daniel Radford)

Semyon Karikov and Gennady Nikitin, trade union leaders from Ukraine and Kazakhstan, visited our city recently to learn about the role institutions like unions play in the community and in our system of government. Their visit was made possible by the AFL-CIO's Free Trade Union Institute under a grant from the U.S. Information Agency. We at the Cincinnati AFL-CIO Labor Council served as their local hosts. I had already been on several educational exchange trips to Romania, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic under the same FTUI/USIA program.

Why are these exchanges important, and why should our government support these

types of activities? Simply put, because it is in our direct interest to help the countries of Eastern Europe to build institutions—like unions—that bring the rule of law and economic stability to their countries.

Educational exchanges can assist in this process. During their visit, for example, Karikov and Nikitin met with county and city officials from both political parties, with union leaders and rank and file members, and with community political activists. They were given an overview of labor's role in protecting workplace rights and in expressing the voice of workers in politics and economics of a democratic society. They can take these lessons about involvement back to their unions and communities at home.

While Semyon and Gennady visited our city, we learned something too, about how hard life is in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Workers labor in dangerous conditions with no safety equipment and return home to eat their meager meals in the dark and cold because there is no heat or electricity. At times they go weeks and sometimes months without pay; they continue working just to keep their jobs.

Workers in Eastern Europe are still struggling for democracy. In Ukraine and Kazakhstan democracies are not established, and the rule of law doesn't exist. In Ukraine, for example, a man summoned to the police station for questioning was tried, convicted, and carted away to prison on the spot. In both countries, the so-called ex-communists have teamed up with former security officers and mafia-like criminal elements to dominate many aspects of society.

So, for humanitarian reasons alone, the U.S. should remain engaged in helping those who seek to build democracy in Eastern Europe.

It is in our own interest as well: the lack of stability in Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and other countries in the former Soviet Union directly threatens the United States. Organized crime groups in Russia alone are roughly ten times larger than the American Mafia. According to FBI Director Louis Freeh "these same crime groups also pose a significant and direct threat to the United States * * * (they) are engaged in a wide range of criminal activities, including complex tax and health care fraud schemes, extortion, money laundering, and drug trafficking."

An even more ominous threat, Secretary of Defense William Perry recently warned, "are (the) still more than 20,000 nuclear weapons in four countries of the former Soviet Union; Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus." He points out that these weapons "could be reconstituted into a threat or that some of them could find a way to rogue regimes."

A growing web of international organized criminals who can control—and sell—sizable stockpiles of nuclear weapons: it's a crisis waiting to happen.

Only a firm, stable government and economy can keep these weapons and criminals under control. Democracy with worker participation can help stabilize nations like Kazakhstan and the Ukraine.

As we have witnessed with Solidarity in Poland, unions have been key in advancing the spread of democracy in the region. And, as we see here at home, unions have a crucial balancing voice in a market economy. During my FTUI visits, I saw Eastern European unions taking steps toward greater political and community involvement, pushing for free elections, a free press, and an understanding and control of economic forces. I think our educational exchanges helped move this process along.

It's fair to ask ourselves if in this time of cost cutting, we can afford programs like the one that brought Semyon and Gennady here.

In light of the potential serious threats the U.S. and rest of the world faces, and because of the benefits we all can gain from an exchange of ideas, we should consider whether we can afford not to.

□ 1200

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on National Security be allowed during the Memorial Day district work period to file a report on the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, and I would simply observe that this was cleared with the minority. We appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE VALUE OF EDUCATION

(Mr. MARTINEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone can dispute the fact that education is one of the keys to success.

All one needs to do is look around and see that the leaders in every walk of life are generally educated people.

Mr. Speaker, so many of our immigrants came here with no education and not much else either.

But they worked hard and sacrificed so that their children could have an education and reap the harvest of the bountiful opportunities in their wonderful new country.

As a result, each succeeding generation did better and we as a country enjoyed the fruits of that harvest.

Sadly, as hard as it was for the first Americans, it is not that easy anymore—costs are up and the economy is down.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the price of freedom is a well-educated people, and our Founding Fathers thought so too when they created a public school system to educate every young person in our country.

Now, as today's leaders, we should realize in a modern world that K through 12 is not enough to keep us competitive.

If this is true, and I think most would agree, then why is the leadership

on the other side of the aisle—who incidentally are both college professors and know the value of education—leading us away from a full education commitment in a way that will allow only the very rich of this country to be educated?

EXCERPT FROM "PRISONERS OF THE JAPANESE"

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been slowly going through an incredible book by a fine Australian author named Gavan Daws. The title of the book is "Prisoners of the Japanese." I have to return it this week to the Library of Congress, so I secured a copy from William Morrow Publishing in New York.

I would like to read a paragraph from the young publicist Justin Loeber and why I want to do an hour on this book and the broader theme of the unbelievably savage and brutal sadistic medieval torture of our POW's by Japan under its warlords.

Young Justin Loeber writes to me: "On a wider scale, this book, 'Prisoners of the Japanese,' is a story of compassion for the elderly. After reading Mr. Gavan Daws' book, I now have more patience for that old person who is standing in line at the post office—the person that has a limp or bad eyesight and moves a little slower than the rest of us. This person could have been tortured by the Japanese. Also, this book has taught me to commemorate Memorial Day as it should be, not at the mall celebrating the greatest sale of the year, but honoring those people who fought for our country. I"—this is Mr. Loeber—"will be going with Gavan Daws to the 50th reunion of the survivors of Bataan and Corregidor in Braintree, MA, over this Memorial Day weekend."

Mr. Speaker, I will do an hour on this later.

BE RELEVANT, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago the President insisted in a press conference that he was relevant. Mr. Speaker, it is time for him to prove his relevance.

As a freshman Member of this House, I was under the assumption that the President and the two Houses of Congress worked together diligently when legislation would affect the very future of our country and future generations. Saving our country from bankruptcy is just such an issue. Yet where is the President on this issue?

Last week President Clinton indicated to New Hampshire radio interviewers he would offer a plan to bal-

ance the budget in either 7 or 10 years. But insisting on remaining irrelevant, this week Mr. Clinton backed away from yet another campaign pledge and said he would not offer a plan to balance the budget and save the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President is attempting to play politics with a very important issue. I hope he will reconsider his political stance and join the freshmen and other Members of this body as we attempt to give a future to our children that includes the ability to leave them the family farm and not simply the mortgage.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LET'S BE TRUTHFUL ABOUT MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, those in this Chamber who know me know that I am a person who values integrity. You also know that when I speak on the floor and discuss issues, I try to be as factual as possible; perhaps that is my scientific background, my scientific training coming to the fore.

But I have to confess that I was upset this morning. I have been upset over the past several weeks at the attempt of the other side of the aisle to beat upon the theme—and I really mean the word beat and beat and beat again—to beat upon the theme that somehow the Republicans are trying to cut taxes by \$300 billion and they are trying to cut Medicare by \$300 billion to pay for the tax cut.

That is absolute nonsense. It is a falsehood. It is a lie. Those who are uttering this lie day after day in this Chamber should be ashamed of themselves, and I call upon them to stop with their falsehoods.

First of all, their numbers are not correct. They have simply arbitrarily picked them as \$300 billion each to try to make them match, but the numbers are not exactly that. This is used to try to mislead the public.

Furthermore, this is not tit-for-tat. The tax cuts are not for the rich, as you hear over and over again, \$300 billion in cuts for Medicare to pay for \$300 billion in tax cuts for the rich. I happen to think that allowing parents of children to keep \$500 more of their money for every child they have, regardless of the income of the parents, is not a tax cut for the rich. Absolutely not.

If you try to analyze the income breakdown of the tax break that was in the tax bill passed by the Republicans, you can verify that only a small percentage of the amount of money will go to the rich. Frankly, it is the rich who pay the most taxes, so anytime you have a tax cut, they are going to get a substantial portion of it back. But it is not a tit-for-tat, and the numbers used on the floor are not accurate.

Furthermore, the statement that we are cutting Medicare by \$300 billion to provide money for the tax cuts for the rich is nonsense, because we are not cutting Medicare. Medicare will increase under the Republican proposal that has been adopted. It may not increase at the incredible 10.5-percent rate that it has been increasing at, but that is nearly three times the amount of increase in the private sector health care cost.

We cannot as a Nation continue to pay 2 or 3 times the rate of increase for those on Medicare that we do in the private sector. Clearly there is something wrong with Medicare if costs are going up that rapidly.

The proposal is to try to make Medicare run more efficiently. Our proposal is to try to preserve Medicare, it is to try to protect Medicare, to make sure that it is there for the people who need it.

If we do not take action to cut the rising rate of cost, there will not be any money left in Medicare after the year 2002. It will be bankrupt and people will not have the medical coverage they have come to depend upon.

That is the problem we are trying to address. It is a problem that has to be addressed in a bipartisan fashion by this House, by the Senate, and by the President.

I am very disappointed that in our attempt to begin addressing that issue, the other side of the aisle, including the President, is not addressing the problem with us. They are not sitting down with us and trying to cooperate, but they are rather getting on their high horse, or standing on their soapbox, and saying "cuts, cuts, cuts" when

we are not cutting, we are only trying to make it more efficient and more responsive to the needs of the people.

As I said at the beginning, I am a person of integrity. I try to be honest, and I have tried to be honest in this statement.

I truly hope that the other side of the aisle, everyone involved in this Chamber, the Senate, and the White House, will get together with us and say, "Look, we have a serious problem with Medicare." The President's own nominees on the trust fund board have said we have a problem with Medicare. Everyone agrees we have a problem with Medicare. Let us sit down as people of good will and say we have a problem. Let us work together to solve it.

My plea is that we all get together and solve this problem so in fact we can preserve, protect and repair the Medicare system so that we will meet the needs of the elderly, not just now and not just in the year 2002 but for all time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, due to an illness, I was forced to miss a vote on Tuesday, May 23. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Brownback amendment, rollcall vote No. 348.

CALL FOR ABOLITION OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things I wanted to discuss with the House today, first of all with respect to the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of our ongoing effort to both balance the budget and give our children and our grandchildren a better future and to turn back the tide of taxation without representation, which is one of the things that the patriot founders of this country shed their blood for, we have to examine every single program and weed out those that do not provide a vital national service.

By that measure, the Department of Energy should and must be abolished. Under the Clinton administration, the Department failed to adequately meet the minimum requirements of maintaining the operational readiness of our nuclear weapons stockpile. Instead, it appears to have become more of a travel service to satisfy the Secretary of the Energy's wanderlust. Evidence of that failure can be found by simply ex-

amining Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary's schedule. Last Wednesday, May 17 she traveled to Paris in order to give the welcoming speech at an international energy conference on Monday, May 22. Then she went to Baku, Azerbaijan, to give the keynote speech at an oil and gas conference. Today Ms. O'Leary is in Florence, Italy, for a luncheon and a dinner banquet at a conference on geothermal energy.

While these world travels are indeed very exciting, it would be interesting to know just how much they cost. I understand that Secretary O'Leary has transferred at least \$100,000 from other travel accounts, including accounts used by scientists and technicians in the Department's nuclear safeguards and security program, to pay for this globe trotting.

That is the gist of this, that is the essence of this, not so much that we want to micromanage the Secretary's travel schedule but that we are very concerned that money is being taken from other accounts, particularly the accounts that have to do with the safety, security, oversight, and general management of the nuclear weapons that she is charged with being the steward of to pay for this travel.

Indeed, it is my understanding that a number of offices involved in maintaining the safety, performance, and reliability of our nuclear weapons will run out of funds by July, 3 months before the end of the fiscal year, because of the Secretary's personal travel demands. They will run out of travel funds from those accounts.

While Secretary O'Leary's commitment to personally attend these international alternative and traditional energy conferences may be commendable, I find it very difficult to conceive that her attendance in exotic locales is more important than safeguarding our nuclear deterrent.

For that reason I have sent letters to the chairmen of House Commerce, National Security, and Government Reform and Oversight committees asking them to initiate investigations into the Secretary's prodigious travel. Here is a copy of the Secretary of Energy's travel schedule for the period that I was describing.

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak next with respect to the comments of the gentleman from Texas regarding the Student Loan Program.

I have followed this as a member of the Committee on the Budget very closely and I have frankly been astonished at the response of the minority in this case. The issue is whether or not we should subsidize, that is, pay for the interest on student loans during the period of time that a student is in school Or should that money, the interest on that loan, be capitalized and added to the principal amount of the loan at the beginning of the loan period immediately following graduation; I think it is maybe 3 months following graduation.

The amount of money that that costs the Treasury is significant. There is a no question about it. The additional amount of money that it costs each student is not particularly great. It amounts to about \$40 per month.

But here is why I am astonished by the minority's arguments. If you look at the earnings potential for a college graduate versus a high school graduate in this country, what you find out is that on average over the period of a person's lifetime, a college graduate will earn about \$14,000 more per year on average for the entire period of their working career. If you take a 42- to 43-year period as the period that you are going to be working and you figure that the money will have some value as well, time value of money, that means that a college graduate stands to earn, on average, about \$1 million more than a high school graduate.

My question is this: Why should the high school graduates be subsidizing with their tax money, why should they be working to pay for this interest subsidy during the period that the college graduate is going to school?

□ 1215

It does not really make any sense to me because our proposal does not eliminate student loans. To the contrary, it increases the funding for student loans. What it does say is that we will subsidize during the period of the loan while they are going to school, we will actually pay that as an additional loan, but we will not forgive it. It will not be a freebie, it will be capitalized and added as principal at the beginning of the period.

I just cannot understand why Democrats want people who are going to make a million dollars more on average over their lifetimes to be subsidized by hardworking people who go to high school. It does not make sense, it does not make economic sense, does not make any kind of fiscal sense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LAFALCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the twelfth annual commemoration of Missing Children's Day. Today we remember the thousands of children reported missing, pray for their safe return, and hope that 1995 will be a safer year for America's children.

I believe this year will be safer for children in this country because of a bill that became law at the end of last

year—the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children Registration Act. This new law requires those who prey on children, child abductors, molesters, who are convicted, to register their whereabouts with law enforcement for 10 years after their release from prison or parole.

The bill was named, Mr. Speaker, after a very special young boy from Minnesota, Jacob Wetterling, who was abducted from a small community in Minnesota in 1989. Jacob Wetterling was the motivating factor behind my introduction of the Wetterling bill in 1991. Thanks to the bipartisan support here in the House and the Senate and the President's signature, this became law.

Jacob Wetterling is also the reason his family, Patty and Jerry Wetterling, started the Jacob Wetterling Foundation, which is an organization dedicated to preventing abductions and finding missing children. Jacob and the thousands of children who are missing provide us with thousands of reasons to keep fighting for America's kids.

Mr. Speaker, it is alarming when you think of the statistics. The average child abductor commits 177 of these heinous acts before being apprehended the first time. The children of America and the parents of America need and deserve this type of protection afforded under the Jacob Wetterling law, and I applaud the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department for getting this system, this national registration system of convicted child abductors up and running.

The second element of that law, Mr. Speaker, is the community notification provision, a very, very important provision so that when these dangerous predators are released back into the community, child care centers, residents, police departments, and schools will know of their whereabouts. Because of the high level of recidivism on the part of these criminals it is essential that we have this type of community notification. After all, people in a neighborhood deserve to know when a convicted pedophile is released back into their community.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join me in wearing a white ribbon today as I am and send this message to American missing children. Particularly I send this message to Jacob Wetterling. You are always in our thoughts and prayers, we love you and we will never, ever stop looking for you.

"PRISONERS OF THE JAPANESE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad there is a friend in the Speaker's chair as Speaker pro tempore today so I do not have to worry

about whether or not I am taking an hour away from someone's getaway Thursday afternoon, a friend in the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who understands and loves history. I was just showing the gentleman some of the pictures in the book that I am about to discuss at length in this historical special order, the book titled "Prisoners of the Japanese." And the gentleman and I were just discussing up there on that lofty perch I believe the most important in any legislative body in all of history or anywhere in the world today, and he said to remind people that everything I will be talking about for the next hour also pertains to Cuba. Cuba at this moment is committing under an evil dictator, Fidel Castro, ghastly human rights atrocities in their prisons, up to and including in some cases, and you and I have heard the testimony firsthand from Armando Valladares, in some cases equally as savage as what I am going to read about the Japanese warlords and what they did all over the South Pacific through Burma, into Indonesia, what they did to Chinese prisoners, Russian prisoners, American, Australian, and British prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, we are told over and over by all of the cable outlets in this country that about 1 to 1½ million people watch the proceedings of this Chamber, and sometimes if it has been a slow or mundane legislative day the ratings actually go up if there is a special order of quality on the House floor.

Because of that million-plus audience and because our Galleries are filled with students today I want to give a warning that if any parent is home and they have a child 11 years of age or under, and I will explain in a moment why I am going to put the cutoff at 11 and under, I could recommend that they ask them to go outside and play or busy themselves in some other part of the house. If there is any parent in the Gallery with a child of 11 years of age or younger, I would suggest that they leave the Chamber, because I had nightmares the last two nights reading this book, and I am in my sixties. The reason I would say 12 years of age and up can handle it is for the simple reason that I was in the 11th grade when the Second World War ended and I went to movie theaters where the newsreels were there whether you wanted them or not, and I saw the newsreels of the Nazi atrocities, all through occupied Europe, and I remember specifically having painful thoughts, if not nightmares, at film of the British taking a double camp, Bergen-Belsen, and finding so many bodies of tortured human beings, most of them Jewish, that they used bulldozers to build mass graves and then pushed the bodies like cordwood into these mass graves. It was black-and-white film. They showed the women camp commandants and guards, brutal-looking, every one of them excessively overweight, stocky, tough, cruel faces. And the British soldiers, typical young "tommies" in their late

teens or early twenties, made these Nazi, SS women guards in the women's camp carry these emaciated bodies over their shoulders. They would not let them drag them. That gave them that little bit of dignity, these last remains of these terribly abused and tortured human beings, they would put the bodies over their shoulders but still contemptuously throw them into the pits. I saw that at 12 years of age. Therefore, I think 12-year-olds should be able to handle pictures of what happens to babies taken out of their mothers' wombs and killed, or killed in the womb. I have always used as an example if I could handle that at 12, then why do we hide in the abortion debate in this country the photographic evidence of the evil fruits of abortion, and I believe that in this memorial week-end that 12 years of age and up is sufficient to handle the horror that I am about to read.

So my daughter, Robin, is watching, all three of her children, Kevin, Colin, and Erin should go outside, but my older grandchildren back here I would expect to watch this speech. I hope they have been informed.

I read in my 1 minute, Mr. Speaker, a beautiful letter from a publicist at William Morrow & Co., great publishing house, and he put his heart into this letter. He did not have a clue that I would read this to the whole Nation, but it so touched me what he said that I want to read it for a second time today to set the scene for the horror that I am about to discuss.

Justin Loeber writes to me as of yesterday:

"Dear Congressman Dornan:

"Thank you for your request for Gavan Daws"—he is an Australian—"book entitled, 'Prisoners of the Japanese.'" This is the only book that documents the Japanese atrocities of World War II. Mr. Daws' primary purpose for writing this book is to pressure the Japanese Government to acknowledge and apologize to the POW's for their horror" inflicted upon them "and being that the 50th anniversary of 'VJ' day is coming up, will the POW's" of the Pacific campaign "finally get their due? Since most Americans think that WWII ended on 'VE' Day"—on the 8th of this month, May 8, the 9th for Russians, the 7th was the day that General Jodl signed the unconditional-surrender document, and by the way I looked up in my encyclopedia and reminded myself that Jodl was hung 1 year and 5 months later on October 16, 1946, 1 of 11 hung as a result of the Nuremberg trials of the top leadership of the "Hitler gang." Eisenhower would not go to the signing ceremony, he was so offended by what he saw at Buchenwald and Dachau when we had overrun those camps a few weeks before.

But that was 50 years ago this month, and as Mr. Loeber says, most Americans think that was the end of the war.

But the war ending on V-E Day, ending the Holocaust that Japan had

brought to the Pacific, is probably the biggest secret in history, particularly for our young students, I might add. Gavan took over 10 years to research his book. He lives in Hawaii, but coincidentally is on the east coast right now. I spoke to him from the Cloakroom yesterday. He will be here until June 2. He will be on the Charlie Rose Show tonight. I did a show with him, the Blanquita Collins Show out of Virginia that goes to about 12 States. He was a fabulous, fascinating guest. And the Washington Times is doing a feature story for this month and People magazine will have a story in July. "However; its people like you," Mr. Congressman, "who can actually pressure our Government to ask for the POW apology—by August 15, 1995 ('VJ' Day)."

Actually, Justin, V-J Day was September 2 on the deck of the *Missouri* when General MacArthur in that stunning voice of his asked General "Skinny" Wainwright to step forward. He had himself survived 3½ years of brutal Japanese captivity, and he accepted the instrument of surrender from the Japanese. There is a big plaque on the deck of the "Big Mo" that is now mothballed up in Puget Sound in the State of Washington.

Here is the paragraph I read earlier, Mr. Speaker.

"On a wider scale, this is a story of compassion for the elderly. After reading Gavan's book, I now have more patience for that old person who is standing in line at the Post Office—the person that has a limp" or whose eyesight is dim "and moves a little slower than the rest of us. This person could have been tortured by the Japanese. Also, this book has taught me to commemorate Memorial Day as it should be—not at the mall celebrating the greatest sale of the year, but honoring those people who fought for our country."

□ 1230

"I will be going with Gavan Daws to the 50th reunion of the survivors of Bataan and Corregidor in Braintree, MA, over Memorial Day."

Now, I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, I can rearrange my schedule, it does not look easy, to go up there.

I told you about the 3½ hours that I spent with a Bataan death march survivor and Army officer, named Eugene Holmes, the colonel that Clinton had so viciously and manipulatively used to dodge the draft, and for 3½ hours, with our colleague, JAY DICKKEY's son, who is in law school at the University of Arkansas, we listened to some of these horrible stories.

I remember when this bright, young law student walked outside with me. He said, "Congressman, I am indebted to you for letting me drive you and bring you to Colonel Holmes's house. I never heard stories like this in all of my education."

The one I remember, a simple one, far less horrific, I am about to read, was a young West Pointer who was

caught with one cigarette in a camp on the island of Mindanao after they moved them down from Luzon. They were working in fields there. He was caught with a cigarette. The brutal Japanese guard, unusually tall for a Japanese at that time, 6 foot 1, called all the assembled prisoners out, all of them wearing nothing more than what would be called a thong bathing suit, all of them skinny, sunburned, ulcers and sores all over them.

He told this young West Pointer to hold his hands in the air. He said, "When you drop your arms, you will die." He lasted for about 3 hours, and as his arms slowly came down, this Japanese lieutenant shot him in the face.

I looked across. I could see the tears in the eyes of Congressman JAY DICKKEY's son. I think his name is Tim. There were tears in my eyes. As many times as Irene Holmes had heard this story, there were tears in her eyes. She said that Colonel Holmes does not plan to write a book on the Bataan death march that he survived or his 3½ years in captivity, and even does not talk about it much.

Most of the veterans, I guess, are going to take their stories of brutality to their graves with them, and that is why taking the oral histories by so many in Australia, his native country, in Britain, and from our Americans, and from Chinese, the service that Gavan Daws has done is powerful.

Now, what started me to read this book, I took it out of the library 4 months ago, had not gotten around to it with the rush of events with the 100-day contract and so forth, was this cover story building up to Memorial Day of last Sunday in this fantastic Washington Times newspaper. I will do a commercial for them, Mr. Speaker. Everybody in the country can get a national edition of this Washington Times. You want to get the unadulterated, top-notch reporting of our time on Whitewater, on four people in the administration under indictment who are under special prosecutor investigation, including the Clintons themselves, you will get the unexpurgated, unliberal-manipulated truth in the Washington Times.

Here is the front-page story, last Sunday. There are Japanese heroes on this, a handful only, unfortunately. "Japanese doctor lectures as penance for the horrors that he inflicted on war prisoners. Tokyo. As a young army physician during Japan's occupation of northeast China in World War II, Dr. Kim Yuasa says he honed his surgical skills on healthy Chinese prisoners. 'I would remove the appendix. Then we would amputate both arms and then both legs.'"

If the prisoner would come to, Mr. Speaker, imagine what he would think about God in heaven and his fate in life, looking down at his torso, his arms and legs gone, his body stitched up, wondering how long he had to live, wondering what his family was doing

at that moment and why God had consigned him to this lonely death far from his home with nobody knowing or to pray for him at the moment that his soul goes to God.

Dr. Yuasa said at his press conference in Tokyo, he had the guts to do this. Their duma, Mr. Speaker, their congress, does not want this discussed. It is censored. It is bottled up. Talk about extremist groups. I guess liberals would want to call them right-wing groups, extremist groups in China, excuse me, they have them, too, in Japan, will threaten to kill people that come forward to tell the stories of the atrocities of the Japanese warlords.

You know, Mr. Speaker, for 2 decades in this House I have tried to give dignity to the German people and the German nation by always using the words "Nazi" or "Gestapo" or "Hitler gang" or "the forces of evil that had taken over Germany," so as not to blame a whole nation, particularly the generations born since then, and I also adopt the same policy with the nation of Japan because not having a Nazi party as such, Bushito warriors were not known as much as the SS or the Gestapo, the only way I could do it was to always say the warlords of Japan and Tojo and his warlords, Tojo's gang. And now I am going back to something I have not done in 50 years in saying the Japanese or Japan, because this Nation refuses to apologize for this. They will not even discuss it, the formal people in the government, and, therefore, that relieves me of my obligation of sensitivity to say the warlords, so in reading this article in the book and its title "Prisoners of the Japanese," I will not say the warlords of Japan, because it is time for the nation of Japan to try and seek the dignity it has denied itself for over 50 years.

There are heroes in Japan. This man who committed these ghastly atrocities is such a hero for publicly doing penance. That is in Shinto philosophy, Confucianism, Buddhism, it is certainly the core of Judaism and Christianity and Islam to make amends for your sins.

Sometimes the prisoners were shot, Dr. Ken Yuasa says. "We would shoot them, and then we would practice removing the bullets from them, keeping them alive to train on their internal organs. Typically, surgeons would cut and cut until their patients stopped breathing; sometimes without anesthesia. I dutifully carried out these operations as duty to the emperor," Dr. Yuasa, now 78 said. "There was no conscience in us to tell us these were inhuman things. Today he travels Japan, lecturing to anyone who will listen. Beyond his personal act of public penance, he wants the nation of Japan to admit some of history's most grotesque atrocities. Fifty years after the end of World War II, Japan's "parliament," our brother legislators there, in the Diet, they refuse to issue an apology for the brutal conquest of much of East Asia.

Most Japanese politicians do not even believe Japan did anything wrong. To varying degrees, they believe Japan waged a type of holy war to liberate China from the white man. Japanese politicians rarely say so publicly, because international outrage inevitably forces them from office, but they answer to fringe nationalist groups violently opposed to any official show of contrition.

Dr. Yuasa spent the war attached to Japan's infamous Unit 731. The unit, among other things, used live prisoners as guinea pigs, thousands of them, in an attempt to develop the ultimate biological weapon. If they had known about Ebola in Africa, they would have had Ebola, using it. They used plague, anthrax, bubonic plague, infected thousands of people with it. At the unit's headquarters near Harbin, a captured area of China, Manchuria, Lt. Gen. Shiro Ishii considered human experimentation crucial in gaining a decisive edge over weak-willed adversaries in the West, according to accounts from survivors and witnesses, pieced together by honorable Japanese and western historians. These accounts show that Ishii instructed thousands of doctors, thousands of scientists and technicians, to inject American, Australian, British, Chinese, and Russian prisoners of war with tetanus, anthrax, bubonic plague, and every other germ that they could cultivate.

Between 3,000 and 12,000 prisoners, euphemistically referred to as logs, like a log of wood that you could burn on the fire, the Japanese word is *maruta*; when they entered the compound, none ever emerged alive save for a handful liberated at the war's end, and I have never heard of that handful, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to research this to find out where those people, if any, are alive today to give firsthand testimony.

Here is a captured picture in the Washington Times that is from Gavan Daws's book of emaciation studies, where they would starve prisoners to death and photograph them until their eventual demise.

The author told me there is another book out that I have the Library of Congress researching now, called "Unit 731," by Peter Williams and Peter Wallace, two British authors that researched it. I will be back to do another hour on that.

This has to be a one-man crusade. I am going to get the Japanese Diet, their congress, to face up to these atrocities.

By the way, when I first came to Congress in 1977, I knew all about Unit 731. I went up to Fort Meade. I went to the Army Chemical Corps. I am sorry to say I was lied to, either lied to or stupid people told me the records were destroyed or no longer existed that we got from General Ishii and brought back to this country, letting all of these war criminals go from Unit 731 at the very same moment we are hanging, properly, for crimes for genocide and

crimes against humanity, the perpetrators of Hitler's war in Europe.

It says that one technician who traveled with the doctor, Yoshio Shinozuka, joined Unit 731 as a 16-year-old, so he is only 66 years old today. We ought to have him over here to address Members of this distinguished body.

Using a special incubator developed by Ishii, he cultivated germs to cause amoebic dysentery and typhus. "During a skirmish with Soviet troops on the Mongolian border in 1939, we dumped three drums of these germs into the river," although he would be 72 today, because this is 1939, he is 16. "We dumped three drums of these germs into the river to contaminate the entire water supply, Mr. Shanozuka, now 72 years of age, said last week. Although some Japanese soldiers also got sick, the experiment apparently convinced Japanese officials, all the way up to Hirohito." That is why I did not want George Bush or anybody going to his funeral. Goodbye, *das vidanya*, good riddance, Hirohito.

The effect of this germ warfare and the project began to expand dramatically. Apart from germ warfare, Unit 731 devised a series of exotic experiments to improve the chance of survival for Japanese soldiers in combat.

So the researchers pumped prisoners full of horse blood in an attempt to develop a blood substitute. They all died. They deliberately inflicted women prisoners with syphilis to discover ways to halt the epidemic of venereal disease among frontline troops.

A little footnote here; thousands of Korean women, teenagers, kidnaped and used as prostitutes for the Japanese Army, all the way down to Java and Sumatra, all over into Burma, into Thailand, young Korean teenagers used as prostitutes, called "comfort women," no official apology, Mr. Speaker, from the Japanese Diet, their congress, to Korea. These women have bought airfare tickets over to Japan and Tokyo and demonstrated in the street in front of the Diet, without an apology. Those, being teenagers, would be in their sixties today.

They baked prisoners to death in dehydration chambers, starved prisoners on limited diets on research on nutrition; to test artillery shells riddled with anthrax and gangrene, scientists would tie prisoners to stakes, shielding their heads and backs while leaving their legs and buttocks exposed to exploding bombs. I guess, with the language barrier, these poor God-forsaken prisoners could not say, "Why are you doing this to me? What kind of a hell hole have I discovered myself in here?"

Some of the Chinese prisoners could probably speak Japanese. What would they say?

Then they treated the infected shrapnel wounds and then coolly recorded every detail that ended up here in Maryland.

In the days ahead, as the victims slowly succumbed to infection, often

writhing in pain, some prisoners survived the germ injections only to be subjected to the frostbite experiment.

□ 1245

The prisoner's limbs were dipped in water over and over and exposed to sub-zero temperatures. I am told limbs made a hollow thud when hit with sticks. Prisoners languished, some of them conscious, as doctors amputated blackened, decaying limbs to keep them alive for only more experimentation, all in an attempt to discover the optimal treatment for frostbite. Unlike Nazi counterpart Josef Mengele, who experimented on twins as though he were some demon from hell, Ishii escaped being labeled a war criminal. He retired in Japan on a comfortable pension. Many of his subordinates became key officials in Japan's military community. Dr. Haisato Yoshimura, director of Unit 731's frostbite atrocity experiments, became president of Kyoto Medical College and an advisor to Japan's expedition to Antarctica.

Years ago I watched a documentary on Japan's Antarctic expedition. I looked at photographs of it a year ago, January, when I was down in Antarctica, and I was thinking what a tremendous scientific effort they have made. Little did I know they had a Dr. Mengele, war criminal, leading their Antarctic expedition.

Most members of Unit 731 are either dead or senile. If they are senile, I hope they walk into the ocean, as did Mengele in a beach community in Brazil to take his own life and throw himself back in God's face. But the unit is still alive. These ex-killers and scientists were doing penance. It is still alive, the mentality of it, in Japan, though Dr. Yuasa and Mr. Shinozuka find themselves unwelcomed in Japan's parliament and constantly harassed by Japan's ubiquitous nationalists. The reception in Japanese schools is much warmer, and that is the hope for Japan, the decent young citizens in Japan will listen to these men.

Now, I took Daws' book, "Prisoners of the Japanese," and I went to the index, and I looked up Unit 731, and I want to read a couple of references from this book so that people will understand the political atrocity that was going to be perpetrated on American citizens in our own National Air And Space Museum, the most visited museum in the world. Martin Harwood, you deserve to resign. That you were going to portray the exhibit of the fuselage of the Enola Gay that dropped the atomic weapon on Hiroshima, that you were going to portray this as a racist war against a noble people defending their homeland. I brought up Unit 731 to his face with SAM JOHNSON sitting at one elbow, and JOE MCDADE and Tom Lewis of Florida, combat veteran from the air war over there.

I wish BEN GILMAN had been there, who was saved by landing at Iwo Jima as a young gunner on B-29's. But it was

SAM JOHNSON who put Harwood away when he asked him directly, "Would you, Dr. Harwood, have dropped the bomb?"

He says, "I would have followed orders."

"Would you have dropped it?"

"No, I wouldn't have."

SAM JOHNSON put his hand in his face, and he says, "Well, I would have, and that's the difference between you and me."

Thanks to the election of November 8, SAM JOHNSON is now on the board of directors of the Smithsonian Museum.

But listen to these few references to 731: The first time it comes up in the book, he writes:

"In Manchuria, at Pingfan," and that is a name that should ring down through the pages of history, with all the horror of Auschwitz, Dachau, Bergen Belsen, Buchenwald, Kelmo, Treblinka and Mydamit, it should have the same ring, and nobody has ever heard of it in this country: Pingfan, outside the city of Harbin, the epidemic prevention and water supply unit of the coumintang army—how is that for a euphemism? The epidemic prevention of water supply unit, Unit 731, had a compound of 150 buildings, thousands of scientists. In our old block, row block, they did experiments on human beings. The Kem Pai Kai brought them prisoners for guinea pigs, men, women and children, Asians and Caucasians. They were called maruta, meaning logs of wood. They were infected with cholera, typhoid, plague, syphilis, anthrax. Others were cut up alive to see what happened in the successive stages of hemorrhagic fever. Others had their blood siphoned off, replaced with horses' blood. Others were shot, burned with flame throwers, blown up with shrapnel, left to develop gas gangrene, bombarded with lethal doses of X-rays, whirled to death in giant centrifuges, subject to high pressure in field chambers until their eyes popped out from their sockets, electrocuted, dehydrated, frozen, and boiled alive.

Two prisoners were put on a diet of water and biscuits, worked nonstop, circling in the compound, loaded with 20 kilograms of sandbags on their backs until they dropped dead. One lasted 2 months longer than the other, and all this research into malnutrition was done so that the Japanese army would be stronger in its conquest.

Our old block at Kingfan, where the Japanese kept killing human experimental subjects under scientifically controlled conditions, but the book of starvation could have been written on the bodies of prisoners in Japanese camps anywhere.

And then Daws goes on to document throughout the whole Pacific theater how this set the standard for all Japanese camps.

One or two more references, and then I will come back to this floor next month with Marshall Williams' book on just unit—this unit alone.

According to Japanese figures, of the 50,000 prisoners that they shipped, 10,800 died at sea, more than any other American battle. Americans that had survived 3 years of imprisonment, survived the Bataan death march, from Camp O'Donnell, Cabana Twan, they were sent off to ships without any markings on them and sunk by friendly fire. What a sad tragedy those were. The POW transports were not part of Unit 731. They were not control laboratories for experiments on suffocation, starvation and dehydration. With the nationality of the prisoners a deliberate variable, still in the way men of different nationalities behaved in the holes, there were observable differences for their sick experiments.

299: Short of verifiable and verified facts and conceding that neither Unit 731 nor anyone else set up those prisoner transports as controlled experiments, it does appear that POWs of all nationalities were subjected to essentially the same dreadful stresses in the holes that they were doing scientifically at 731.

Now we are coming up on the 50th anniversary of these following events. In the history of Japan, the invincible Japan, as far back as their Sun God, this was the first time that commoners had ever heard the voice of their emperor. This is August 15, 50 years ago. He is saying the war is lost and they are surrendering, and the first words of this first emperor to speak directly to his people were about catastrophic humiliation. The unconquerable Japanese empire had been terminally crushed in war, forced into abject surrender. The voice of the Son of Heaven went out into the poisoned air of Japan, out by shortwave to his empire in ruins, and World War II was over.

Not quite, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues. For months the Japanese army at Osaka had been killing drowned American airmen, airmen like our BEN GILMAN, poisoning them, shooting them, chopping their heads off. After the emperor spoke, the last five were taken out to a military cemetery. The war is over now. How would you like to be their parents? Mercifully, their parents probably never knew this. Three were shot, two were beheaded the same day. Hours after the peace had begun, Japanese officers at Fukuoka on Kyusu took their samurai swords and chopped to death 16 American airmen. The war is over, and this is being done, the squad commander brought his girlfriend along to watch.

On the Celebes Islands in Indonesia; for our high school students, that is the island that looks like a big octopus—well after the war was over, 2 weeks later, two Australian airmen were strangled to death, and it was 12 days after the emperor's broadcast on August 22 that the Japanese at Ranau on Borneo killed the last 30 of their surviving prisoners. Meanwhile, in Manchuria, at Unit 731's laboratories at Pingfan, near Harbin, the Japanese machinegunned to death 600 Chinese

and Manchurian laborers that kept up these 150 buildings from hell and killed all human experimental subjects, the logs. They were gassed to death with toxic chemicals, poisoned with potassium cyanide in their food. Their bodies were stuffed, one after another, in incinerators—does that not conjure up the Nazis' sick death camps in Poland—or dumped in a pit in the courtyard and burned. Then the bones were sunk in the river nearby, all the laboratory specimens, too. A huge charnel heap of tortured and infected and vivisected human flesh that they kept was so big that it would not burn.

The Japanese general in charge of Unit 731, soon to run a medical school, the man directly responsible from start to finish for 6 years of hell, wanted all his staff and families to commit suicide. They were issued poison. Of course, he was not about to take poison himself, and neither did hardly any of his people. Instead they bailed out of Pingfan at top speed, about 2,000 of them. I wonder how many hundreds are left alive in Japan today. The parting gesture of Unit 731 was to turn thousands of infected rats loose on this world.

Final reference: Imagine their congress not apologizing for this and us letting them get away from it after the way we groveled properly the Germans' face into the dirt with Nuremberg war trials, creating a gulf of communication block between the fathers and the sons of Germany. Every time I rode in Germany in the late 1950's, early 1960's, I would look at the back of my cabdriver or somebody, and I would think, "Would you have guarded a camp?" It was a serious judgment that we put on a whole people in Germany, and Japan escapes all of this. Why?

Now here is the thing that broke my heart because I have always held MacArthur in high regard and considered him a hero. Daws makes the case it was MacArthur at the top. It was his reasoning that said Ishii should be spared a war criminal trial. There was another class of Japanese that MacArthur did not want to see tried. All the people who ran Unit 731 at Pingfan. In fact, he made sure they were never brought to court. I am going to have to check this out, Mr. speaker. You hate to have your boyhood hero demeaned in your eyes. If ever there were Japanese war criminals, these were the ones. Their lethal medical experiments on living prisoners were atrocities as morally disgusting as anything in the 20th century, but the American military had a use for advanced research in biological and chemical warfare.

So they cut a deal with General Ishii Shiro, immunity in return for all of his evil records. For General MacArthur, the lives and deaths of the logs, the maruta, those thousands of suffering, poisoned prisoners' bodies, appeared to be worth nothing legally, morally, or humanely. The only nation to bring any Japanese from Unit 731 to trial was the Soviet Union. The Russians con-

victed 12, from a lieutenant general down to a private, but no death penalty. Well, how could they, with what was going on in their gulag camps and torture? Two years for the private, 25 to the general, plus a loud public accusation that Ishii and the rest of the morally guilty were safe in hiding, which was true. Immediately after Tojo was hanged, December of 1948—what took us 2 years longer to hang him than the 11 with Martin Bormann maybe still on the loose than the 12 that we gave the death penalty to in Europe?

Mr. Speaker, I will terminate this horror story still hidden by the Japanese congress, their Diet. I will never look at them the same way again. I will never travel to Japan with the same frame of mind that I have in the last few trips until I see some decent apology to these prisoners.

Look at this picture of this New Zealand handsome young fighter pilot, a P-40 "Kitty Hawk" pilot, having his head cut off. Look at this handsome, tall man standing here. He probably died in the camps.

The prisoners of Germany, American POW's, this is so totally separate from the horror of killing 6 million Jews and 5 million other people in Hitler's death camps, but of our prisoners, less than 1 percent died in the German camps, but in the Japanese camps over a third of our American prisoners died.

□ 1300

"Daws' book, Prisoners of the Japanese, POW's of World War II in the Pacific, is a searing," this is from the Washington Post, "462-page indictment of the particular and gratuitous savagery that Japan," notice they do not say warloads, "inflicted on more than 140,000 allied prisoners of war who were starved to skeletons, worked to death as slaves, if they weren't first hacked apart, burned alive, or dissected alive as guinea pigs for experimentation in germ warfare and medical sadism." That is by Ken Ringle.

Mr. Speaker, there is a debate that goes on in the medical community now over what should be done with the evil fruits of all the German experimentation, the Angel of Auschwitz, Dr. Mengele, I do not know why we do not call him the Demon of Auschwitz, all of those medical experiments. There are some things in there that medical science could profit from. But theologians and ethicists in Israel say you cannot get any good out of this medical experimentation, even if it would save lives in the future, because so many people died horribly to extract it. So it stays bottled up in the archives of the United States of America.

But the other horrible experimentation, under Tojo and Hirohito in Japan, it is also locked up somewhere. But it has disappeared, unlike the German Nazi evil experimentation. It is somewhere. And I think that if Simon Wiesenthal is correct, that no war criminal from Nazi Germany anywhere

in the world should know 1 minute of sound sleep at night, the same should pertain to these Japanese war criminals.

Everybody who hears the sound of my voice who is going to give a second of decent thought on Memorial Day to the 50th anniversary of the Memorial Day between victory in Europe and victory over Japan, should ask their local bookstore and library to get Mr. Daws' book, "Prisoners of the Japanese," and read about the worse atrocities, that cannot be forgiven because nobody has said we are sorry or asked for forgiveness or an apology.

That is my gruesome contribution to the heroes of World War II.

One of these sleazy semi-pornographic street papers, in reference to my Presidential quest, said, Mr. Speaker, that I was a perennial son. That was supposed to be an insult.

If that means I am a perennial son of my father, who won three wound chevrons in World War I, two of them for mustard gas, a poison gas, that was the beginning of this century's introduction to this type of nightmarish demonic horror, then, yes, I am a perennial son to him and to every World War II veteran that I looked up to as young Greek Gods when I was 12 years of age and all the Army nurses with them, including the ones that suffered this type of captivity in the Philippine conquest that were taken prisoner at Corregidor.

Mr. Speaker, have a nice Memorial Day. Mrs. SCHROEDER, about to speak, have a nice Memorial Day. I know this touches your heart. Remember these people when we were young kids that we looked up to, our World War II veterans. It brings tears to everybody's eyes to see the handful of remaining World War I veterans walking down the street. Well, 50 years plus 4½ years in imprisonment, 6 for the British, 3½ for our Wake Island survivors, there are a few alive, they will be up in Braintree, MA, the Bataan Death March survivors. And 10 years from now, at the 60th anniversary, they will be marching at the head of parades, in wheelchairs, on crutches, helped along by the younger veterans from Vietnam or from Mogadishu or God knows where else we will have to send young men and now women to die for liberty.

I hope people on this Memorial Day and next Armistice Day and on V-J Day, which you can celebrate twice, August 15, the cessation of hostilities, September 2, the deck, remember what I read, that people were being murdered and beheaded and slaughtered before the day they surrendered on that deck of the *Missouri*. I am going to find out why our U.S. Army and our chemical warfare departments used this evil, satanic, ill-gotten, bloody scientific knowledge and did not bring these men to the justice that we did Hitler's gang.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

REGARDING THE ETHICS PROCESS IN THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the Speaker very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor really rather sadly, because as we get ready to go home for Memorial Day break, I want to talk a bit about a letter that a group of us feel we have been forced to sign, and I think we would like to talk a bit about why we feel that we were forced to sign this letter. We certainly hope something is going to be done about this letter when we come back.

This letter was addressed to both NANCY JOHNSON and JIM MCDERMOTT, care of the Committee on Ethics, and it is about the issue of the pending matters in front of the Committee on Ethics that appear, according to news printed stores, to be in deadlock.

You know, we started this year with the big check, the big check that we saw from Rupert Murdoch going to the Speaker for \$4.5 million. And then, all of a sudden the Speaker said oh, no, no, no, we tore up that deal, and it is only going to be \$1, and he would not sign the contract until there was some agreement with the Committee on Ethics about this.

Well, we still have not heard anything from the Committee on Ethics that this has been approved, and yet today we saw announcements that he was going off on a 35 city tour come August break, sponsored, I assume, by the same company that is doing the book. And there are an awful lot of issues around that.

Congressman DOGGETT and I are going to talk a bit about this, because I think one of the real resources we have in this House is the gentleman from Texas, who I believe was not only on the supreme court, but was head of the Committee on Ethics.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman will yield, I do approach this whole issue from a little different perspective from some of my colleagues who have been here for a longer time, coming here new, having at the beginning of this year just finished up a 6-year period on the Texas Supreme Court, chairing its Ethics Task Force, wanting to be sure that this process is fair to the Speaker or to anyone else who might be accused in this body of ethical lapse, ethical wrongdoing.

I have not participated in any of the earlier letters or the press conferences, because it had been my hope that this ethics process, which is set up to be a nonpartisan and I think has been nonpartisan in the past, would operate, would provide due process.

Yet almost from the outset, the response to the complaints that have been filed there from the Speaker has been one of attempting, instead of really providing a reasonable defense, has been one of attacking the accuser, even to the point of intimidation, of saying well, we will pass legislation here that would require anyone who complains about ethics to pay the attorney's fees of the person against whom the complaint is made.

That seems to me to be the kind of special legislation that serves to intimidate, rather than to clarify and to ensure that this House meets the highest ethical standards that I think this Nation has a right to demand.

Then, leaving and entrusting this responsibility to the Committee on Ethics, we were first told they were just too busy, because they had their contract on America and they did not have time to look at the contract with Rupert Murdoch; that there was not time enough to pass the contract and consider that other contract, that \$4.5 million book deal that was looming out there. They did not have time to consider that.

So we waited through the 100 days for the contract to be passed, and justice was really delayed. Then the congressional recess came along. Well, we are taking a little vacation. We do not have time to look at these very serious ethical charges against the Speaker over the book deal because of the fact that we are on recess. So justice was again delayed.

Now apparently justice is going to be delayed through another congressional recess with the chair of the committee saying that it will be sometime after Memorial Day, and I would inquire of the gentlewoman, apparently there is some discussion in the Washington Post that there is a deadlock and the goal may be justice delayed, justice denied by never giving us an answer on these very serious charges that we wanted the Speaker to have due process. But process is due now to respond to these charges, is it not?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for his insight on this, because you are fresher from the outside, having dealt with these issues in other forums. I must say to those of us who have more gray hair and have been around this is puzzling, because for those of us on the inside, we have no idea whether this is justice denied or delayed, or is this justice totally deadlocked.

If it is totally deadlocked, and again we do not know, because all of these hearings are in secret and we only know what we read in the paper, if it is totally deadlocked, how do we move this off dead center? How does any-

thing go forward? Does this then become a way that our ethics rules mean nothing if there is real deadlock? Does deadlock give you the right to go ahead and do anything you want to then?

So I am a little perplexed.

Mr. DOGGETT. May I inquire of the gentlewoman, since I am new to this body, concerning the way these matters have been handled in this House before? This is not the first Speaker against whom charges have been made, nor is it the first Member of this House against whom charges have been made. When those kind of events have happened in the past, might you inform the House today and the American people about how the House has assured that there would not be a biased investigation?

The Speaker charges bias, he says these are all politically motivated charges. Can you tell us what the best way is to get at those charges and determine whether they are blessed or whether they represent a selling of public office?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas makes a very good point. Obviously, the Committee on Ethics is half and half of each party. No matter what the makeup on this floor is, it is half and half.

There have been some serious charges, as we all know, and we are not happy about them, but there have been serious charges in the past against major and senior Members around here, and everyone I remember, from the late 1970's on, ended up getting an outside counsel, because the idea was we needed to get it out of here.

I think if you flipped it and we stopped talking about how personal it was here, if you moved it from under this dome and took it to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and said that the President had some problems with his Cabinet or himself and he said he would let his own people decide that, that would not work. So they get outside counsel, too. In every prior case I remember getting outside, independent counsel when there has been someone of the gravitas of the Speaker.

I would also think that everybody always says these motives are politically driven, or whatever. I do not know if they are or are not. It would seem to me if you are so sure they were that politically motivated and there was nothing to them, you would be more happy to get an outside counsel, because that would then clear the air once and for all.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman will yield, if the real concern, the real motivation were to get away from politics and really get to the bottom and find out if public office has been sold, whether it was for \$4.5 million or whatever the amount involved, whether there had been abuse of public office, whether there had been a violation of the ethics standards that the American people have every right to demand that this body, all the Members of this body, Democrat and Republican alike,

abide by, would not the best way to get to the bottom of that be to get someone, not a Member of this body, not owing allegiance to either party, but to get to the bottom of it, just as quickly as possible, and someone, of course, who would have the power not to take little snippets over the press or to take little sound bites over television, snidely attacking one's critics, but rather could put people under oath, ask them to raise their hand, ask them to place a hand on the Bible, and put them under oath, so we can know the truth, so that their veracity can be tested and get to the very bottom of the charges and determine whether they were justified or not.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I totally agree with the gentleman from Texas. I am very glad that he is saying that, because that to me just seems to be the way to solve this once and for all. It has been the way we have traditionally solved it over and over again. There certainly is enough to do in this body without having all of these other issues swirling around and giving this place a taint. Certainly politicians do not need any additional taint.

So it seems to me that it would be very logical to get it out of here, so we could get on with the normal business of what is going on. But I must also say one of the things that I am troubled by and the gentleman kind of touched it, was that anyone who asked the questions we are asking gets attacked. That really puzzles me. Like we are not allowed to even speak about this. Free speech is now gone on this issue, that if you stand up and ask a question such as our distinguished whip has, there were implications that I read in some of the press clips today that there must have been something terribly wrong with the whip, that maybe he needed counseling or maybe he was psychologically fixated or whatever.

□ 1315

I do not think he is psychologically fixated. He is an officer of this House, trying to retain some dignity and ethical standards and have people look outside. So I suppose we are going to be accused of something tomorrow.

Mr. DOGGETT. Down in Texas, it is said that, if you do not have the facts on your side on a case, you argue the law. And if you do not have the law on your side either, then you attack the attorney or the complainant on the other side. That seems to be what is occurring here: That lacking the facts to support a position, to defend a position in public, lacking the law, since the ethical standards are set out for all Members in this regard, that instead of relying on the law or the facts, that the Speaker chooses to attack those that complain against him.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is right. And I would like to engage with some more colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Let me go back to this letter that he gentleman from Texas and I and other

Members signed today, because I think it is important that we have the record very clear, what it is that we have put in there.

This is going toward the city tour that was being written up. We asked, No. 1, whether the ethics committee had approved the book deal as the Speaker said that they would before he did anything and, if not, then how can they organize these tours before they made that decision? We thought that was a very important issue.

No. 2, we were asking who pays for this tour. A 36-city tour is very, very expensive. Is it funded out of his advance. What is going on? We were told he was only going to get a dollar. I do not think a dollar is going get you to 36 cities. Do you know what? He has got another book. If you can figure out how to do 36 cities on one dollar, boy, has he got a book there.

Mr. DOGGETT. There are airlines down where I come from that advertise peanuts fares, that you can actually fly around the country for peanuts or you can take somebody else along. But you are going to get a dollar and you can fly to 35 cities around the country.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Nobody has got that kind of fare. You cannot even buy a bag of peanuts most places for much less than a dollar. That is a real question that we have.

People will also answer, but he is doing it on his break, so what is your problem? The problem is, Members of Congress are not allowed to take corporate sponsors and have them do their vacation and are not allowed to do those kinds of tours without having some kind of an ethics signing off saying it is okay.

We are also asking questions about, are there any conflicts of interest? Who is paying for the tour and is there any conflict of interest vis-a-vis legislation in front of this body, because we understand, if it is Mr. Murdoch, Mr. Murdoch has some very, very important interests in this body on the telecommunications issues and many others.

And then we are also asking, what other kinds of activities will he be doing on this tour? My understanding is under the rules you cannot have someone else pay for your travel around America to do political events. So that if the gentleman from Texas were to come to my State to speak at universities, for example, and they paid your fare to give your speech, you could not do a fund raiser for me or anything else because then the universities would be underwriting that. So we asked those kind of questions, too.

We went on to ask for more details to find out what is happening. It is very frustrating to have your constituents asking you these questions and all you can say is, well, I may be a Member but we are not allowed in. It is all in secret. We only know that we read in the paper, and we are very troubled by these things, too.

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas about what he can make out of

all of this. I know he got so frustrated he signed a letter, too.

Mr. DOGGETT. Well, it is a very serious matter that we talk about. It is disturbing to not have action, to see justice delayed. But as I look over some of the news reports about this tour, on a lighter note, it sounds like one of these, a concert tour, the notion that Rupert Murdoch and the Speaker together have this joint venture and that this will be the biggest thing since the Eagles went on tour. I know they packed a whole stadium down in Austin, TX. I want to be sure that Austin gets included. I am sure you want Boulder and Denver included on the tour, especially if questions will be permitted so that the people these can ask questions about all this.

I do not know whether they will put out T shirts for the Speaker—Murdoch tour on not, so that everyone can share and know all the sites where this tour is being conducted. But it is a mighty strange thing to right in the middle of what is supposed to be a district work period to have, I guess, some major publishing company of Mr. Murdoch finance this 35-city tour with T shirts and promotions and whatever else might be involved, unless and lest anyone think as well that we lack humor in this or that we lack bipartisanship, I am wondering if the gentlewoman is familiar with today's New York Daily News.

Today's New York Daily News quotes Kevin Phillips, a Republican political analyst, who says, "You have to wonder whether Gingrich is"—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to whether this discussion is within the rules of the House or outside the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not engage in debate concerning matters that may be pending in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. In March of this year, Speaker GINGRICH announced that under the speech and debate clause applying to this Congress that Members were free to speak on any subject at any time. I am wondering if that pronouncement does not control in a situation that applies to the Speaker as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The "Speech and debate" clause does not

apply with respect to the subject of the parliamentary inquiry just asked by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Chair will again state that Members should not engage in debate concerning matters that may be pending in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. DOGGETT. One aspect that we have not discussed thus far in the course of this colloquy about this very serious matter with reference to Mr. Murdoch are the interests that Mr. Murdoch has pending here in Congress and has had pending during this session of the Congress.

The gentlewoman will recall that there was a special provision passed here with regard to taxes, with regard to health insurance for the self-employed. And while that bill had a very important and salutary purpose, to try to help those who are self-employed with the cost of health insurance, since this Congress is doing little or nothing about the health needs of American citizens, there was a provision tacked into it to pay for that provision that concerned various deals with minority broadcasters. I am wondering if the gentlewoman recalls that there were 19 business transactions around this country that were encompassed by that provision. And when it went out of this House, the very body that we are speaking in, and over to the Senate, all 19 of those deals were disapproved.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes. I am aware of that. The gentleman makes a very good point, because that was one of the many issues that made us all wonder what was happening.

As I recall, and let me ask the gentleman from Texas if this is right, when we went out of here, our assumption was in that bill it was totally clean, that we voted for a totally clean bill, and this body had made the decision there should be no special tax breaks vis-a-vis affirmative action deals that had been done like they had been done in the past, where people were really enriched that really were not benefiting by that. And then we were very surprised when it came back.

Mr. DOGGETT. Surprised, indeed. Because though there were 19 transactions that were disapproved, when it came back from conference committee, there was one deal that was approved and that one deal was for Mr. Rupert Murdoch. I guess just a coincidence perhaps with what had been going on in the dealings with Mr. Murdoch having been involved in book deals with the Saudis, with book deals with Margaret Thatcher, with book deals with the daughter of Deng Xiaoping in China, just a coincidence that one of the many deals that he would benefit from that are the subject of action in this House and this Congress of the United States at the same time that all of these concerns were raised about a book deal in this House, that he is the only one in the whole country who gets his special deal cut out.

Does the gentlewoman remember the debate about that measure here on the floor of the House and the fact that when you say surprise, surprise indeed, because there was never one word mentioned. And again, had it not been for careful journalism, we would never have known it was even in there, because it did not say Rupert Murdoch. It simply changed a date in the bill, tucked away a hidden provision in secret, done in secret, never mentioned on the floor of this House, to benefit Rupert Murdoch and no one else.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman remembers it very well. And I also remember the very distinguished Senator who had put it in who believes in those programs. He was very candid. He said I believe in these programs, that is why I have put this special thing in. Being totally surprised it was the only one that survived and said it survived because she heard there had been someone pressuring for it besides herself that had much more prominence.

I want to ask the gentleman from Texas, I am still not sure what was just said to us. I guess we are not allowed to talk about anything in front of the blank committee. Can we say the word?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Can we say "ethics committee" on the floor? Can we say the words "ethics committee" on the floor? Can we say the name of committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the mention of the conduct that may be under consideration within that committee that is questionable.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So we can say "ethics committee" on the floor?

I have another parliamentary inquiry. Can we put the content of our letter to the committee in the RECORD at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of the content of that letter.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So the Chair would have to preapprove. How would I make a motion? Would I ask unanimous consent for the Chair to read the letter?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The content of the letter would be judged on the same basis as the conduct of speech on the floor of the House.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So how would I make my unanimous-consent request then? I would ask unanimous-consent to put in the RECORD the letter that we have drafted, but you are telling me it is subject to approval of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The response that was made earlier stated quite clearly, Members should not engage in debate concerning matters that may be pending in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. And the letter would have to meet the same requirement; that is, if the letter addresses conduct of another Member.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if I may go one step further. I am still a little confused, because there is no way the gentleman from Texas and I can discuss conduct or anything going on in the committee because it is all quiet, it is all silent, and we are not allowed in. What the Chair is saying is, this would be about anything going to the committee.

Clearly, we cannot discuss discussions that we are not party to, we have not seen, and we are not allowed to participate in, even as an audience or as a passive listener.

□ 1330

I am perplexed. Are these new rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The Chair will read from an annotation of clause 1 of rule XIV:

Members should refrain from references in debate to the official conduct of other Members where such conduct is not under consideration in the House by way of a report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or as a question of privilege of the House.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if I might make a related parliamentary inquiry, because I referred to it generally earlier, but I would like to be sure that the Speaker is clear about the nature of my inquiry, about the rights of Members on this floor, on March 8, right here, the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, said, and I quote:

The fact is Members of the House are allowed to say virtually anything on the House floor, routinely do. It is protected, and has been for 200 years. It is written into the Constitution under the speech and debate clause.

My inquiry to the Chair is whether the Speaker's pronouncement controls in the discussion that the gentlewoman from Colorado and I are having, and that others may choose to have about the Speaker, or was the Speaker just mistaken in his constitutional analysis?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The Chair is unaware that the Speaker has ever uttered those pronouncements from the chair in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think they were just across the hall here in the Rayburn Room, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Chair is aware that the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, until very recently gave daily pronouncements there. This is a transcript, verbatim. I would not misquote the Speaker. I would be glad to provide the Chair, in connection with my parliamentary inquiry, his commitment to freedom of expression, which surely must apply to discussion of his own conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has relied on past rulings and statements from the Chair regarding parliamentary inquiries and not on statements outside the Chamber.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the Chair.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. So the only thing

we can look to are statements said inside the Chamber about Members' rights to discuss these issues?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Decorum in debate is governed by rule XIV, and there are countless annotations under that rule in the House Rules Manual. Those are the sources on which the Chair has to rely.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Where would the gentleman and I go to be able to have this discussion? Are we allowed to have this discussion anywhere? The gentleman and I, as I understand, are not allowed to go to the committee, because we are not members. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, unfortunately, cannot treat that as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I must say to the gentleman, I am perplexed, because apparently we cannot talk about an entity that oversees the rules that supposedly govern us, but we cannot go there and we cannot talk about it. I am a little troubled by what we have just learned.

Mr. DOGGETT. It does seem to be peculiar, Mr. Speaker, because one would hope and one would think that we could rely on the official pronouncements of the Speaker of the House concerning the right of Members, that he says has been protected for 200 years under the U.S. Constitution, to discuss matters, and that those matters ought to apply to him as well as to other people. In compliance with the ruling of the Chair, I would hope that the gentlewoman might discuss with me a little bit this whole question of freedom of expression.

I certainly do not want to leave the topic of Mr. Murdoch, because that is clearly not covered by the Chair's rulings. I think that needs to be explored further, given the nature of the letter that has been submitted today.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman, is it not truly vital to this institution that we be able to engage in discussions, in debate and colloquy, about the standards of conduct that people express? I know, I heard many people say last year, before I ever came to this body, they were not content with business as usual, that they wanted real change here; that they wanted constructive change, that they wanted Members of this Congress, certainly the Speaker of the House, to abide by the same ethical standards that they expected of the people that they went to church with and went to temple with, that they should have to meet those standards.

If we cannot debate that here on the floor of the House, and we cannot go into the secret committee meeting that the public does not get a chance to observe, how can we really fulfill that responsibility that the American people have said "Change business as usual"?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I stand here shaking my head with the gentleman from

Texas, because I do not know. I must say, I am very troubled by this. I have never, never wanted to violate the rules of the House. I have never heard of this type of thing coming out, saying "Oh, no, no, you cannot do that."

I remember when I was studying law, they used to have these things called the star chamber and things like that in England, and that was one of the things that our forefathers and foremothers came over to say "We are not going to do that."

I thought the speech and debate clause was in the Constitution, and it said on the House floor we could all engage in speech and debate about issues. However, I would certainly think issues governing the body that we are part of would be very important. It would almost be like saying to doctors, or to lawyers, "You cannot talk about the ethics procedure governing lawyers or doctors." I hope they do, and I hope they as a profession are out there policing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], did he have those kinds of laws when he was on the Supreme Court and when he was in the ethics—what kind of laws did he have about people being able to discuss issues?

Mr. DOGGETT. To be candid with the gentlewoman, Mr. Speaker, there has been a tendency across this country for people to protect their own. One of the concerns that I had about our process in Texas was that it was not open enough. Our commission, the task force that I headed, actually recommended that the process be opened up more in Texas, because people would lose confidence in their judiciary, in the impartiality of their judiciary, if they could not see the process transpiring. There may be some situations with a frivolous complaint, where it is appropriate initially to evaluate it in secrecy. I do not say secrecy has no place.

However, with matters of this type dragging on for months without due process, it seems to me that the public is entitled to know a little more, and surely the Members of this House ought to be able to come here in front of the American people and have a legitimate debate, given the history of this country and its commitment to freedom of expression, given the pronouncement of the Speaker himself right here in this building on March 8 that Members of Congress could say anything, and that they usually do about these matters; an intelligent, an incisive discussion of how it is that we can assure the highest ethical standards, which are demanded of the Speaker and demanded of me and the gentlewoman from Colorado and of every Member of this House.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am totally agreeing with the gentleman. I am very saddened, because I always remember the things about Caesar's wife and so forth; if you are in public office, you are held to a higher standard. There-

fore, I think it is incumbent upon all of us to engage in that, and to have a little sunshine.

Government is not a fungus, it can thrive in sunshine. What we are saying, we cannot even get into that. I almost feel like it is *deja vu*. I am back to where I came. When I joined this body 22 years ago this was going on in the committee I was assigned to. It was all closed. Nothing ever went on in public. All sorts of things transpired. I remember a young freshman and myself would try to sit in on those Members, and they would call the Sergeant at Arms and threaten to drag us out, and all sorts of things. We got all that kind of opened up, and now I see things closing back down in a limited fashion. I do not think that is what the American people wanted to see here.

However, I want to ask the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker, let us just think about this. I guess we have committed a great faux pas, and I know there are going to be people here tracking us for the next 10 days. We did not know we could not come here and have this discussion. What do you think you are going to be called, partisan, fixated? What do you think you are going to be called the next 10 days?

Mr. DOGGETT. It is hard to guess. I know some were supposed to need to see their analysts just for having the audacity to make ethical complaints. I do find all this—I am still trying to learn the rules here as a brand new Member, not having been a part of the system that existed.

If those are the rules, it seems to me we need, if within these very restrictive rulings it is permissible to do so, to look at those rules, to look at the way the ethics process is done here, and see whether we are really fulfilling our responsibility to the American people to assure the highest ethical standards.

I suppose if there is not another opportunity to do that, and we are precluded from doing that here, perhaps in the midst of this tour that is going to take place that we have written about today, this tour that is like a rock star tour to go gallivanting around the country, 35 or 36 different cities in your State I am sure, and in mine, that perhaps we could go out and talk with the American people ourselves during the course of that tour and ask them for their thoughts as to whether they think their elected representatives, Democrat and Republican alike, ought to be able to stand there on the floor of the House, ought to be empowered by the voters across this country to stand here on the floor of the House and at least be able to discuss the ethics of the Speaker of the House, the third most powerful person in the entire country, and who may think he is even more powerful than being No. 3.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has just thought of the perfect symbol for this tour. How about a gag, with the 35 cities, and we could have a gag. I think we have had a gag

order. I guess we cannot talk about some of the issues that drove us to sit down and write this letter.

Mr. Speaker, we laugh about this, but I find it very sad, because we go around the world and talk about how great our country is and how wonderful it is, and we believe in free speech, and we believe that we are all big enough to be able to deal with these issues in the open, and we are finding, I guess, some backsliding on that; that anybody who asks questions gets called some names, or that all sorts of innuendo was made. I do not know how we are going to be able to police ourselves if that continues on.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I do not want to call names, but I do think, and I want to comply with the ruling of the Chair, I think it is within the ruling that we do have to go back and take up one name, and that is Mr. Rupert Murdoch. I am not talking about the \$4.5 million book deal. I am talking about Mr. Murdoch and his legislative interest here.

We have talked about the fact that of all the people in the world, he is the one that got the special hidden tax break, the tax break this House was never told about. He made tens of millions of dollars that were at stake there. That has already happened this year. That is one gift that he has already gotten, with all the influence that he has with the Speaker and other Members of the House, is this special tax break, corporate welfare.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As the gentleman also knows, about telecommunications—

Mr. DOGGETT. I wanted to inquire of the gentlewoman about that.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I can hardly get through the building where my office is for all the high-priced lobbyists.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is it true there are more telecommunication lobbyists here than there are Members?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think there are. You can tell them because they have better shoes. They have much better shoes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is not one of those key issues in the telecommunications bill, which I believe is being marked up, perhaps, even as we speak for consideration there in the Committee on Commerce, one of the real issues about those foreign shoes that are there, about whether or not the media of America are going to be owned, foreign ownership, by people like Rupert Murdoch?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is exactly right. Let us face it. There are two things going on here that we understand he has a great interest in. No. 1, we understand that he has been talking about maybe being able to buy the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, or some of the programming, or whatever. I am not too sure I want him owning Big Bird. Big Bird was one of the few things that was on for my kids. That

has been at least in the process as an interest, that he was interested in.

He has not come and talked to me. I am way low on the totem pole. My average campaign contribution is 50 bucks. Murdoch does not bother with poor white trash like me.

The other thing that I understand that he is very interested in is the foreign ownership issues. We have not allowed foreign ownership of our communications, because we felt it was very, very important for national defense, for a lot of things. They are trying to change that, along with maybe other things that I am sure he has an interest in. When you get to be that big a guy, with that much money, megabucks and gigabucks all over the place, I am sure there are a lot of other interests that you and I do not know about, also. It just looks like a conflict, shall we say.

Mr. DOGGETT. On the same day that the letter is filed that we are now, apparently, going to be denied an opportunity to talk about with one committee of this House, another committee of this House is there marking up a telecommunications bill, deciding whether Rupert Murdoch and other foreign interests can come in and can take over the media outlets which report what it is we can and cannot say on the floor of this House.

That is one very big interest, in addition to the great tax break that he got, that the gentleman from Australia has at stake here. In between signing book deals, there is the matter of a few tens of millions here, and then I guess with the telecommunications, we are not talking about tens of millions or hundreds of millions, we are talking about billions and billions of dollars that are at stake. That is why all these hundreds of lobbyists are around here, is that not correct?

□ 1345

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is absolutely right. The very puzzling thing is there are areas where you know you should not go, the black areas and the white areas. Then there is this big gray area. When you look at this, if these lobbyists want to give you money, it must be in the open, it must be recorded, they must file it at the Federal Election Commission so you can see it. But the issue is can they give it to you in another way so it is way beyond the limits, like could they fund a tour for the gentleman from Texas of 35 cities, setting up public relations for him everywhere he goes. It would be worth zillions of dollars. Who knows what that is worth?

But obviously they would be way beyond a campaign limit, and could that possible influence the gentleman? We do not know those issues. But those are the things that are out there and those are the things that trouble an awful lot of us here.

We hear, well, people have not talked about this before. Maybe no one has been quite this creative, who knows?

But I do not like it. I am frustrated by it.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would ask the gentlewoman, there may be some people, and I am sure that was a concern with this letter, who view themselves as little more than a butler for the super-rich, the kind of people who go around with a tray saying, "Here, Jeeves," or "Here, whoever it might be," and for whom \$4.5 million is little more than a good tip.

When you have something at stake, and the gentlewoman mentioned the Public Broadcasting System, the only really quality children's programming in this country, and yet there are people right there in the well of the House who stood up and attacked it as socialist television, who criticized the Big Bird lobby, and yet are there not some of those super-rich from other parts of the world who if they can take over the Public Broadcasting System and can run it as a giant commercial enterprise instead of a truly publicly supported television system like we have in Texas and a public radio network, a national radio network that is public that all the people have a chance to participate in without commercial enterprise, should that happen, would \$4.5 million for a book deal not be little more than a good tip?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman makes a very interesting point. As you know the gentlewoman, I think, a couple of weeks ago was called a socialist by a Member on the other side of the aisle, and I said to them, "You can call me whatever you want. I believe in free speech. It doesn't bother me." But the interesting thing is I thought he was for socialism of the rich. Socialism of the rich is a whole new concept but that is kind of what we are seeing. How do we give these benefits to the rich who already have more than they should ever have?

But I think the gentleman from Texas and I have probably been gagged and shut up and we probably cannot talk about too much more or they are going to put us away.

Mr. DOGGETT. I suspect that that is rather true. I know the gentlewoman shares my commitment to a truly free enterprise system. But that free enterprise system relying on private capital, relying on the hard work of millions of American families who have made this the greatest country in the world, that can be perverted when people get special favors here and they say they are for free enterprise and against socialism, but they do not really want free enterprise. They are willing to pay out substantial amounts of money to those who would peddle influence in the most sacred institution of this country, who would pay out millions of dollars because they have billions and trillions at stake.

That is the kind of thing that motivates a letter to say, let's not delay justice. The American people demand justice. They demand justice even if it involves a person who says he is the

third most important person in this entire country.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I just want to end this by saying, the gentleman that preceded us in this well was talking about many of our veterans. It is Memorial Day that we are breaking for. I must say they gave their lives for this wonderful, great Government and not for the best Government money can buy. All we want to make sure is that we are not finding a new way for people to be able to buy this Government.

We get frustrated with this Government, sometimes this Government makes us absolutely nuts, but I must say overall I will take this Government against any other one in the world. I am going to do everything I can to make sure everybody has a fair chance, everybody has a fair shot, and that we do not surrender to new clever ways that lobbyists find to get their time.

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to turn the podium over to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

I wish everyone also a happy Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman from Colorado may control the balance of the hour designated by the leadership.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OVERSIGHT ACT

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join Mr. SCHIFF, my colleagues from New Mexico and a former district attorney, in introducing a bill to safeguard our constitutional rights as we fight terrorism.

The tragic bombings in Oklahoma City, 2 years earlier in New York City, awakened all of us to the fact that America is not immune to terrorist acts. This has quite appropriately prompted the President and many Members of Congress to suggest additional steps to prevent terrorism and to make punishment for terrorist acts swifter and more certain. It is essential for Congress to see that we are doing all we should do to prevent the horror and tragedy of another Oklahoma City.

But talk about stepped-up counterterrorism efforts has also raised among the public the concern that law enforcement agencies may slip over proper constitutional boundaries in combating terrorism, that their actions to keep us safe may sometimes collide with the Constitution's wise restraints that keep us free.

The bill we are introducing today, the Constitutional Rights Oversight Act, responds to these concerns.

The bill would establish a top-level inspector general for counterterrorism activities to head a new independent office, to be responsible for ensuring that Federal counterterrorism activities comply with constitutional standards.

The most important feature of the new inspector general will be the cross-

cutting scope of the authority of this office. Unlike the existing inspectors general of various departments, this new IG will have oversight authority for many different agencies. The new IG will review the counterterrorism activities of agencies as diverse as the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

In short, this new inspector general will have the authority not simply to review the actions of a Department, but to watch the counterterrorism activities of all agencies, to assure their adherence to the Constitution and their full respect for constitutional rights.

Besides the power to review, the new inspector general would have the power to act, in two significant ways.

First, agencies would be required to keep this new inspector general informed of requests for judicial or administrative authorization for searches wiretaps, and similar surveillance activities. The new inspector general would be kept similarly informed about deportation actions related to the right against terrorism.

In connection with all these proceedings, the new inspector general could make suggestions, or oppose the requested authorizations, to the extent appropriate in order to protect constitutional rights.

Second, the new IG would receive public complaints about alleged or potential violations of constitutional rights. Upon receiving these complaints, the IG could require relevant agencies to respond.

Finally, the new IG will be responsible for submitting periodic reports to the President and the Congress concerning the observance of constitutional requirements, and the protection of constitutional rights, in connection with Federal counterterrorism activities, and to make suggestions for improvements.

But just as important as these particular powers I think will be the restraining effect of the mere existence of this new IG. The requirements for immediate constitutional accountability that the office would impose on counterterrorism investigations should serve to deter any tendency a Government official might have to be casual about constitutional safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, the American public has a very real stake in being protected from terrorism. It also has a high stake in seeing that the Government doesn't cut constitutional corner in providing that protection. We do not need to trade our constitutionally protected rights, including the rights to privacy, free assembly, and free speech, for enhanced protection from terrorists. If we should make that mistake, terrorism will have achieved a victory.

As with all other law enforcement efforts in our country, in fighting terrorism the Government must balance the need for security with the rights of the

people. Sadly, our history provides several examples of the Federal Government compromising basic constitutional rights to thwart perceived national security threats.

The FBI's clandestine COINTELPRO Program provides but one stark example of such governmental arrogance. In the name of national security, then-Director J. Edgar Hoover presiding over a program of unauthorized surveillance and harassment of those who legitimately protested government policies. Given this history, there are serious concerns in the country about giving expanded investigative powers to Federal authorities.

We are introducing the Constitutional Rights Oversight Act to help ensure that protection of civil liberties is part of the counterterrorism debate. The House should consider this measure as part of any counterterrorism legislation that comes to the floor. By its enactment, Congress can demonstrate our commitment to protecting both public safety and personal freedom and will provide the right response to the public's fears both of violence and of Government abuse of civil rights. A nation which so reveres its constitution deserves no less from its Government.

MEDICARE AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RECOGNIZING OUR VETERANS

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the Speaker. I know the Speaker has appointments he has to make. I appreciate his willingness to stay and be here for these special orders, and also to thank those that are working on behalf of the House so that we have this opportunity.

I do not often seek the opportunity to address the House in a special order, but I do so today to talk about our Federal budget and what we as the Budget Committee have done to try to get our financial house in order.

But I first want to say that as I listened to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] in talking about the atrocities that took place with Americans under captivity by the Japanese during World War II, I just could not help but think how important it is that that story be told, as gruesome as it is, and that the families of those men know that we will not be silenced in making sure that the truth be told.

When I think of Memorial Day and the men and women who gave their life to this great country, I know, as someone who never served in the armed forces, that when I look at the flag behind me, that the flag means a great deal to me obviously as a Member of Congress and as an American citizen. But to someone who fought in battle, the American flag means something more than we could ever imagine.

When they think of the American flag, they think of the soldiers, their friends, their comrades, their brothers who died in battle. They think of the people, the families they contacted to let them know about how their brother or sister or son or grandson died in battle.

And when I think of Memorial Day, and when I think of how blessed we are as American citizens for their ultimate sacrifice, I also think of the families. I think of the mothers who held their sons, who never will be able to hold their sons again. I think of the fathers that went and saw their sons or their daughters playing baseball or go to a dance, or be there when their children were sad and needed a reassuring arm, and I think of what those parents have to live with.

I also think of the brothers and sisters who lost their brothers or sisters and the memories that they have. I think of the precious children who were denied the opportunity to have their father or their mother, particularly their fathers in the case of World War II, come to their baseball games, come to their schools, see them get married.

So as a Member of Congress, I just count my blessings every day, absolutely every day, for the opportunity I have to serve here.

When I listened to the debate that was taking place and the comment made by the Speaker and the ruling made by the Speaker, I thought of an experience that happened to me a bit earlier when I brought a complaint against a chairman of a committee after he had been indicted, and I wanted to do just what these two Members had done. I wanted to share my complaint and my letter, and I was ruled out of order.

I did not like it at the time, but I began to think about it and I began to realize, first, the rule that you invoked, Mr. Speaker, has existed for over 70 years. And part of the reason for that rule is that in this Chamber it is important that a Member who is being accused of something have the opportunity to be present and to defend themselves.

□ 1400

I also realize that you did not make up a new ruling, you just enforced a ruling that was enforced on me under Democrats, a rule that was in their rules for as long as we can remember and we just continued their rule.

So, as disappointed as I was when I was not able to submit my letter, I realize that in this Chamber we work with each other, we deal with each other and we have to be fair to each other. There is nothing to prevent me, as I ultimately did, to just speak directly to the public but not in this Chamber.

With regard to what we are trying to do in this Chamber, last year in an election we established what we thought would be a very important dia-

logue with the American people, we established a concept that said we were going to make a contract with the American people, and we had 8 things that we wanted to do on opening day and we had 10 things that we wanted to do during the course of the first 100 days.

What was memorable about that for me was when I was up for reelection and I met with an editorial board they said how could you have signed such a document, and the question I answered this way by asking a question, I asked: What do you think of what the majority party, then the Democrats, were going to do on the opening day; what did you think about the 10 things they were going to do in the first 100 days; what did you think about their plan and their contract with the American people? And I just waited for the answer. Obviously there was not a contract with the American public, there was no sense of what they wanted to do on the first day, the 8 reforms we wanted to do and the 10 major pieces of legislation in the first 100 days. And I think I take extraordinarily pride in the fact that when we were up for election as the minority party we came forward with a plan, and it did not criticize Democrats, it did not criticize the President, we said we want to change this place. We want to downsize Government, we want to have open rules, we want to pass legislation which I helped author saying Congress should abide by the same laws that we impose on the private sector. The first bill that passed that Chamber, signed by the President, it was bipartisan. But we came forward with a plan, and one of the parts to that plan was a balanced budget amendment.

Over 300 Members voted for a balanced budget amendment. But last week we did something more important. We voted to balance the budget, and to my left I have a chart which describes what we intend to do and what we will be doing. The red line is the spending that seems to go parallel with the bottom line which is revenues; they never meet. As long as I have been a Member of Congress we have had deficits. In fact, when I was a State legislator and I watched Congress in the State legislature, we have to balance our budgets, but in Congress we have not. And when I was in the State legislature I kept waiting for Congress to get its financial House in order. Thirteen years I waited and then I had an opportunity to serve in Congress, and I worked and waited for an opportunity to finally vote on a budget that would get us balanced. And that is what we do. We slowed the growth in spending; spending still goes up on the average in the aggregate and it ultimately meets the growth of revenues in the 7th year.

We are going to spend more money each year on the aggregate in our Government. We are just slowing the growth, and what we are trying to do is end deficit spending. There are some young people in this audience who may

not know that if we do not succeed in slowing the growth in spending, by the time the young people are adults they will be paying 70 percent of every dollar they earn in taxes to the Federal Government to help pay for the debt that is taking place today. And what is starting to happen in our dialog is we are having the elderly say you cannot do this, and we have the young who are not aware of what we need to do, and hopefully during the course of the next few months we will have an open dialog, young and old, talking about what we need to do. We need to slow the growth in revenue, and that is what we are going to do and that is what we voted to do last week.

The second chart shows spending in three ways. The yellow is the national debt, the interest that we pay each year on the national debt, we pay \$235 billion of interest payments on the national debt. That could go for housing, it could go for our military, it could go for our schools, it could go for a whole host of other things if past generations had not deficit spent, but they have. We have just such a large debt that our interest is now 15.4 percent of our budget.

Only about a third of our budget is domestic spending and defense spending, what we call discretionary spending. There is foreign aid in here. I vote on one-third of the budget as a Member of Congress; as a Member of Congress I do not vote on anything over here in the blue. All of that is entitlement. These are Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and other entitlements, food stamps, agricultural subsidies. They are an automatic pilot, they just keep happening and happening and happening.

But I vote on this, what is in the pink, what is discretionary spending, and what we are looking to do is actually have real cuts in discretionary spending. We are going to try to slow the growth of entitlements but still allow entitlements to grow, and we are going to try to keep down the interest payments that we are making every year.

Half of the budget is on automatic pilot.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to comment on the charts and to compliment the gentleman for what he has done.

I had two town meetings last week-end and I used charts similar to those the gentleman is using, and I deeply appreciate the work the gentleman has put into this. I have found that in my town meetings by the use of the charts the gentleman is displaying the public was fully understanding of the problems that we are trying to address, recognized the importance of them, and are able to get past all of the rhetoric they have heard from those who are trying to make political hay out of the

problems of Medicare and the problems of balancing the budget.

I simply want to commend the gentleman and I hope many people hear his message, and I certainly thank the gentleman for preparing these charts, and I find them a valuable educational tool.

Mr. SHAYS. That was a nice treat, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan and thank him for his work in trying to get this story out. The bottom line is what we want to do is slow the growth in Government spending and get our financial house in order so future generations will not have so much debt.

In particular, what I have singled out as a focus is the amount of money we spend on Medicare and Medicaid. You cannot see it very easily, but it amounts to about 17 percent of our entire Federal budget. It is equal to all domestic spending. Medicare and Medicaid are equal to everything we spend in the legislative branch, everything we spend in the judicial branch, everything we spend in the executive branch under the President of the United States, all the various departments and agencies, all of their grants are equal to 16.7 percent or \$256 billion. Medicare and Medicaid are greater than that amount. The difference is Medicare and Medicaid are growing at alarming rates and we need to find a way to slow that growth.

Defense spending is equal basically to discretionary spending. But a third of the budget is what we vote on in the House.

Some people say to us well, why did not Gramm-Rudman make a difference? The reason is Gramm-Rudman only focused in on the pink part of that pie, only on discretionary spending. It did not focus at all on entitlements.

What we have done in defense spending is to have a basic level playing field. It is not going to go up; it is not basically going to go down. Discretionary domestic spending is going to go down, and foreign aid is going to go down.

Then we come to Medicaid. Medicaid is health care for the poor. It is also health care for poor elderly as it relates to nursing care, and it is going up. Medicaid spending is going to go up by about 36 percent in the next 7 years. We are not cutting Medicaid; we are allowing it to grow.

Some Members of Congress say we are cutting Medicaid and/or we are cutting Medicare. We are cutting them if you use this definition, if it costs \$100 million to run a program this year and the next year to run the same program with the same level of service, not changing the program, it costs \$105 million and we appropriate \$103 million, in my home, in business, that is a \$3 million increase.

Congress, the White House, the press in Washington, and only in Washington, they call that a \$2 billion cut. Medicare is going to go up by 36 percent in the next 7 years. We are going

to spend \$324 billion more in the next 7 years than we spent in the last 7 years.

Now admittedly we are not going to allow it to grow as quickly, but the important point, when you look at this, is to recognize that Medicare is going to go up, Medicaid is going to go up in terms of what we will spend in the next 7 years by 36 percent more than the growth in the population.

What is happening to Medicare? Medicare is actually having an extraordinary challenge facing us. The challenge that faces us with Medicare, and it is Medicare part A, that is Medicare that goes for hospitals, Medicare part B is what goes for health care services, Medicare part A is starting to go bankrupt next year. In other words it is going to take in less money than it spends out, but it still has money in the trust fund. Ultimately in 7 years Medicare part A goes bankrupt, it literally runs out of money. In other words, in the seventh year there will be a \$7 billion deficit in the trust fund. The trust fund will have run out of money.

What we are looking to do with Medicare is to save it. We are looking to improve the service. We are looking to preserve Medicare. We are looking to save it. And this is not a report done by Republicans or Democrats in Congress, this is a report given to us by the trustees of the Medicare system. It is going bankrupt unless we save it, and that is what our objective is.

The way we save it is to slow the growth in Medicare, by slowing the growth in Medicare so that it does not grow at over 10 percent a year, but grows approximately 5 percent a year.

If we allow Medicare to grow each year, in other words spend more, not cut, grow, and spend more, we are going to allow it to grow by 45 percent in the next 7 years. Only in Washington is a growth in spending of 45 percent called a cut, only in Washington.

And unfortunately we are hearing people saying we want to cut Medicare. No, we want it to grow; we want it to grow at 45 percent. We just want to make sure when it grows it does not bankrupt the rest of the country. So it will go from \$178 to \$259 billion.

What that means is that we want to spend \$659 billion more in the next 7 years than we spent in the last 7 years. We want to spend that amount of money.

What will we spend, almost \$1.6 trillion as opposed to \$925 billion in the past 7 years.

I think the most important statistic though is the one that shows what we do per beneficiary. We want to spend \$4,116 per beneficiary instead of \$6,000 and have it grow to \$6,361 in the seventh year. We are going to spend 45 percent more in Medicare. We are going to allow it to grow, and the increase per beneficiary is 32 percent. Only in Washington would an increase per beneficiary of 32 percent, 32.1 percent be called a cut, only in Washington. I do not know anywhere else where

when you spend even more money you call it a cut. We are going to spend 45 percent more total in Medicare and 32 percent more in the next 7 years per beneficiary.

Which gets me to the last point that I want to make. If we do not control the growth in Medicare and Medicaid, we are doomed. We are already to balance the budget in the next 7 years going to see foreign aid go down 5.4 percent more a year. We are already going to see domestic discretionary spending go down 1.6 percent a year, that is a cut, that is a cut any way you look at it. We are going to spend less dollars in the next year. Defense spending goes up one-half percent, and there are some, and I am one, who would like it not to be as high. The challenge we have in defense spending is we are \$150 billion oversubscribed in defense. We have to find a way to reduce defense spending \$150 billion in the next 7 years just to stay within this number. And how do we get oversubscribed? Because Congress and the White House kept pushing off the procurement of certain defense systems to the sixth year and we were working on 5-year budgets so the full cost of these programs never truly showed up.

We are going to have a difficult time staying within this number, only because we are oversubscribed in defense.

But what is happening in Social Security? It is going up 5.1 percent. What is happening in Medicare? It is going up 5.5 percent. What is happening in the Medicaid? It is going to go up 4.5 percent a year? What is happening in other elements? They are going to go up 3.9 percent.

Recognize this is the growth in spending and this is half of the Federal budget. It is going to grow. Sadly, the interest payments we make are going to go up about 1 percent a year, but before we passed our budget they were going to go up 5 percent a year.

So we have slowed the growth of interest payments, we have slowed the growth of defense, we are actually making real cuts in foreign aid and domestic spending.

□ 1415

And I have to say this in conclusion about domestic spending, there are some cuts I do not want to make in domestic spending. I mean, there probably is not any Member of Congress who likes every part of our budget, but if we take the logic, "I do not like 10 percent of the budget, I am voting against it," that is just going to duplicate what has happened during the last 10 years. We can always find something we do not like in the budget.

What do I like in this budget? I like the fact that we are getting a handle on Government spending. I like the fact that we are slowing the growth of entitlement programs. I like the fact that we are saving Medicare from bankruptcy. I like the fact that for the first time in my 20 years in public life I got to vote for a budget that gets us balanced.

Admittedly, it is going to take us 7 years, but we are doing it, and I am proud to be part of that effort.

I will just conclude by saying ultimately what we do is going to have to be worked out with the President of the United States. He has to sign this legislation. I am hopeful he will finally weigh in on trying to find ways to save Medicare. I do not mean that sarcastically. I just mean it as openly as I can, because right now there is no plan coming out of the administration. But ultimately we need to pass a budget that gets us balanced in the next 7 years. We need to do it for the people who are in this country today, and we need to do it for our children and for our children's children, and for our children's children's children.

We have simply got to wake up and do it, and in the process of our plan, we are going to spend more on health care for the elderly, more on health care for the poor. We are going to spend more on some of our entitlement programs. But we are going to reduce spending in a whole host of areas.

Farmers are going to feel the reductions. People in urban areas are going to feel the reductions. People in rural areas are going to feel the reductions. We are all going to be part of this effort. We are going to save this country. We are going to save this country so it can be the great Nation it has been for so long.

And, Mr. Speaker, I really thank your kindness in staying. I know you needed to go. I appreciate the time you have afforded me.

AGENTS OF INFLUENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Japanese auto companies enjoy a 25-percent share of our American automotive market. By contrast, our auto firms have only a 1.5-percent share of Japan's market. In fact, all foreign automotive companies, including the European, the Asian, only have a 4-percent, 4-percent share of Japan's market.

This is because of the insurmountable, unfair trade barriers Japan erects to protect its home market from any kind of foreign import that would really give competition to Japan's home market suppliers.

What does that mean to our country? It means that last year we, again, for the 10th time in this past decade had a \$66 billion trade deficit with Japan, and over half of it in the automotive arena. For each billion dollars of deficit, that translates into 20,000 more jobs we could have right here at home.

In fact, when you think about it, if we could have auto trade equity with Japan, we could build 100 more companies in this country each employing 5,000 people in an industry that pays its people a living wage.

America also fails to stand tall in the ongoing United States-Japan trade standoff because of the influence exercised by lobbyists here in this city by Japanese industry throughout the corridors of power. What do I mean? This past week, the Washington Post revealed that one of our most prominent and influential political writers and columnists and broadcasters, George Will, that we have all seen on television, in the newspapers is married to a lobbyist for foreign interests who earns almost \$200,000 a year working for, are you ready for this, Japan's automobile manufacturers' association, the chief lobbying group for Japan's interest in this country and around the world.

Mr. Will has been writing columns and has been on television fulminating against the Clinton administration's actions against Japan's automakers, but he fails to mention that his wife's lucrative affiliation with these companies is providing very adequate income for his family. Astoundingly, when this connection was revealed, his response to this conflict of interest is, "Well, it's just too silly." That is what he is quoted in this article as saying.

The article says his wife's firm is paid \$200 an hour to deal with reporters, to follow legislation, to place advertising, issue press releases and draft articles for newspapers with such titles as "Selling Cars this Japan: It Isn't About Access" or "Fixing the Outcome of Trade with Japan is a Dangerous Way to do Business," castigating the approach that the Government of the United States is taking on behalf of the people of the United States.

The article says her firm also sought to arrange for the industries, Japan's industries' top Washington lobbyists to meet, guess who, the Chicago Tribune editorial board, she tried to place an opinion piece in the Washington Times, and drafted letters to the New York Times and Detroit Free Press.

What does Mr. Will say about all this? He says, "Well, to me, it is beyond boring. I don't understand the whole mentality."

Well, as one Member of Congress, I do not think it is silly. I do not think it is boring. I understand what influencing opinion is all about. I think it is a question of agents of influence who operate in ways that influence our press, press who are supposed to be objective and factual, and as one professor says in this article who is an associate dean of Columbia University's Journalism School, he says, the same kind of conflict questions that apply here also apply to extended families. The fact Mr. Will does not see a problem shows he just does not get it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clinton administration to hang tough for America and the American people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for May 23, 24, and 25, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SKAGGS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FATTAH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today, at her own request.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 72, 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, June 6, 1995.

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m., pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 72, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 6, 1995, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

911. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal various reporting requirements of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

912. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 47 and 49 of title 10, United States Code, and chapter 15 of title 37, United States Code, to improve the quality and efficiency of the military justice system; to the Committee on National Security.

913. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund [ESF] for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

914. A letter from the Executive Director, Oversight Board, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on the status of various savings associations, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1441a(k); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

915. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 95-21: Transfer of \$3.0 Million in fiscal year 1995 Economic Support Funds to the Peacekeeping Operations Account to Support African Peacekeeping Efforts in Liberia, pursuant to section 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

916. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter expressing his concerns with regard to H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

917. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's report pursuant to section 1352 of title 31 U.S.C. for the period from October 1, 1994 through March 31, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101-121, section 319(a)(1) (103 Stat. 753); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

918. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1994 through March 31, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

919. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

920. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the biennial report on the quality of water in the Colorado River Basin (Progress Report No. 17, January 1995), pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1596; to the Committee on Resources.

921. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on the study of the feasibility of constructing, in accordance with standards applicable to Interstate System highways, a 4-lane highway connecting Interstate Route 65 and Interstate Route 10 in the vicinity of Pensacola, FL, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1086(b) (105 Stat. 2022); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

922. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of 12 lease prospectuses for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

923. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the termination of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance when premiums are not paid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

924. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the 1995 Baseline Environmental Management Report, pursuant to Public Law 103-160, section 3153(b) (107 Stat. 1950); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and Commerce.

925. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, the "American Community Partnerships Act"; jointly, to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Ways and Means.

926. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appro-

priations for the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, for fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 156. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-130). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as followed:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1709. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to suspend the registration requirement and the activities of civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and similar local agencies of the Selective Service System, except during national emergencies, and to require the Director of Selective Service to prepare a report regarding the development of a viable standby registration program for use only during national emergencies; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CANADY, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. BONO):

H.R. 1710. A bill to combat terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 1711. A bill to improve the administration of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 1712. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to imports of civil aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ALLARD, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 1713. A bill to provide for uniform management of livestock grazing on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 1714. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require that species which are being considered for listing under that act or are currently listed under that act are expeditiously reviewed for listing or continued listing, respectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FUNDERBURK, and Mr. DOOLEY):

H.R. 1715. A bill respecting the relationship between workers' compensation benefits and the benefits available under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. COOLEY, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 1716. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to assure that the operations of the Forest Service are free of racial, sexual, and ethnic discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 1717. A bill to establish minimum standards of fair conduct in franchise sales and franchise business relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 1718. A bill to designate U.S. courthouse located at 197 South Main Street in Wilkes-Barre, PA, as the "Max Rosenn United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOWEY:

H.R. 1719. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to limit farm program payments to producers who earn less than \$100,000 annually from off-farm sources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the cessation of Federal sponsorship of two Government sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1721. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding ovarian cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1931—known as the Davis-Bacon Act—to require that contract work covered by the act which requires licensing be performed by a person who is so licensed; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the National Labor Relations Board to assert jurisdiction in a labor dispute which occurs on Johnston Atoll, an unincorporated territory of the United States; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1724. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that any Federal employee serving under a temporary appointment who has completed at least 1 year of service in such position within the preceding 2 years shall be eligible for the Government's health benefits program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 1725. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to remove the requirement that exposure resulting in stomach cancer occur before age 30, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend eligibility to use the military health care system and commissary stores to an unmarried former spouse of a member of the uniformed services if the member performed at least 20 years of service which is creditable in determining the member's eligibility for retired pay and the former spouse was married to the member for a period of at least 17 years; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 1727. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand eligibility for commissary benefits for persons qualified for certain retired pay but under age 60; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 1728. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake the necessary feasibility studies regarding the establishment of certain new units of the National Park System in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that providers rather than purchasers of funeral services shall be treated as the owners of certain preneed funeral trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are required to leave their employment because of certain medical or family reasons will not be denied unemployment compensation when they are ready to return to work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1731. A bill to provide for a Federal program of insurance against the risk of catastrophic earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and hurricanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend chapter 30 of title 35, United States Code, to afford third parties an opportunity for greater participation in reexamination proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1733. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for early publication of patent applications, to provide provisional rights for the period of time between early publication and patent grant, and to provide a prior art effect for published applications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BONO):

H.R. 1734. A bill to reauthorize the National Film Preservation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to research

regarding the health of children; to the Committee of Commerce.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan):

H.R. 1736. A bill to amend various acts to establish offices of women's health within certain agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. SEASTRAND (for herself, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HORN, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 1737. A bill to encourage the development of the commercial space industry by establishing State-run spaceports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SKAGGS (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1738. A bill to further the protection of constitutional rights in connection with the conduct of Federal counterterrorism activities; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1739. A bill to establish the Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare to make findings and issue recommendations on the future of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EWING, Mr. STUMP, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. METCALF):

H.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person born in the United States will be a U.S. citizen unless a parent is a U.S. citizen, is lawfully in the United States, or has a lawful immigration status at the time of the birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. EDWARDS):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution recognizing and commending American airmen held as prisoners of war at the Buchenwald concentration camp during World War II for their service, bravery, and fortitude; to the

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 157. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Res. 158. Resolution congratulating the people of Mongolia on the fifth anniversary of the first democratic multiparty elections held in Mongolia on July 29, 1990; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H. Res. 159. Resolution honoring the contributions of Father Joseph Damien de Veuster for his service to humanity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WARD (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. VOLKMER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YATES):

H. Res. 160. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1535) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the tax rules on expiration, to modify the basis rules for nonresident aliens becoming citizens or residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

101. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the 911th Airlift Wing facility; to the Committee on National Security.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. EDWARDS introduced a bill (H.R. 1740) for the relief of Michael Patrick McNamara and Thomas Parnell McNamara, Jr.; which was referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 218: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 246: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 354: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 359: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 436: Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 499: Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 534: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. COX, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SABO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 703: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 789: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 820: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 835: Mr. BISHOP, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 864: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 878: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 892: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 895: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 896: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 899: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 922: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 958: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 972: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 983: Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1010: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YATES, Mr. FOX, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1033: Mr. WELLER and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

H.R. 1073: Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1114: Mr. CHRYSLER.

H.R. 1148: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1149: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1172: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1189: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1192: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1193: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1381: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1535: Mr. OBEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1540: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky.

H.R. 1541: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1546: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1547: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1614: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1627: Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BARR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BAKER, of California, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1660: Mr. FROST, Mr. CANADY, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.J. Res. 79: Ms. MCCARTHY and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Res. 21: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 571: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

22. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to condemning the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4 by Mr. BRYANT on House Resolution 127: Harold L. Volkmer, John W. Olver, Lynn C. Woolsey, Barney Frank, Lynn N. Rivers, Peter A. DeFazio, David Minge, Marcy Kaptur, Sidney R. Yates, John Lewis, John Baldacci, and Martin T. Meehan.